

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER
AND
RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

MARCH, 1854.

ART. I. — THE BIBLE, INSPIRED AND INSPIRING.

THE question of the inspiration of the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures is one of those great moral problems, which never are, but always are to be, solved. It was discussed in the earliest, and probably will be in the latest ages. For it is in part an historical inquiry, and different principles of historical judgment will lead to different conclusions. It is an intellectual and spiritual question, and therefore all the complexities of mental culture and moral character will come into play, and determine each person to his result. But perchance new words will not be thrown away on such a rich and sublime theme, pertaining to the point where the mind of God has connected itself with the mind of man. To-day, as in the morning prime of the Church, when learned fathers mused and wrote, the fresh dew rests upon it, and glistens bright to heaven. Ever new, as ever old, the march of human affairs, the novel experiences of the race, the arrival of new geniuses, and the successive crises of Christianity, cannot drain dry of interest to every conscientious mind the magnificent question.

Man still asks, and will for ever ask, as if it were too good news to be true, *Has the Infinite Intelligence in any sense spoken?* Is there a *Word* of God? Is there

a whisper of the Eternal Wisdom, a breath of the All-brooding Love? And if there is, is it worthy of its amazing origin, and fit for its glorious mission? Have the serene heavens articulated to the ear of the laboring Earth their lofty truths, and explained her dark secret? Has this little globe, where man sins in haste and repents at leisure, in all its revolutions through boundless space, ever gazed on the golden shores of immortality? Or, has no other light ever fallen from the sky but that of sun, moon, and stars; no other voice spoken in the great silence above, than that of the deep-toned thunder; and no other spirit stirred in the bosom of man than his own restless heart? The ear of Mercy suffers not the cry of the young ravens to go unheard; has it not caught as faithfully "the still, sad music of humanity," and vibrated with answering compassion? In reply to such interrogations, we answer, in the first place, generally, Yes; there *is a Word* of God, more articulate than the lessons of the creation; the Highest has spoken, not with the accents of a mortal tongue, but by the revelation of wisdom and love, less clearly unfolded in the law by Moses, but shining forth in full effulgence in the grace and truth of Jesus Christ.

But as soon as we advance beyond this general proposition, we alight upon a hotly contested arena of theological warfare, where several theories find their several champions. First, we have the doctrine of the plenary verbal inspiration of the Scriptures, or of the major part of them, and generally held by the Trinitarian churches. According to this view, the sacred writers were amanuenses to the Holy Ghost, to record whatever was dictated to them, word by word, and sentence by sentence. *The New Church*, or Swedenborgians, hold a similar theory, modified by the doctrine of an internal sense, and correspondences, and also by the rejection of the historical books of the Old Testament, and the Epistles of the New, as uncanonical. The Roman Church adheres to a literal and infallible inspiration of the books of the Bible; but then the truth thus conveyed is only to be administered in homœopathic doses to the mass of mankind, as they are able to bear it, under the lock and key of St. Peter, and his unerring successors in the papal chair. The belief in natural inspiration, — the inspira-

tion of truth and love given to every man, the light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world, but given to some more than others, shining more clearly in Moses and in Christ, in David and Paul, than in others, but shining also in Socrates and Seneca, — this belief is extensively diffused in Germany, and has strong advocates in England and America. By this rule all inspiration is of one and the same kind, and differs only in degree. But the doctrine we prefer is what may be called a moral inspiration; special, miraculous, *supernatural*, but not *unnatural*; above reason, but not irrational; a spiritual even more than an intellectual afflatus, vouchsafed in different degrees according to the age and its wants, from the baptism of the cloud to that of water, and thence to that of fire and the Holy Spirit, the dove and the cloven tongues. But according to this view, the Bible itself is not the identical inspiration, but a record of inspirations; a history, a monument, of that golden age, when the blind Earth, after all her far, solemn voyages around the universe, put as it were into port, saw a vision of angels from the heavenly hills, and heard as the mighty sound of many waters the voice of her Sovereign.

We would remark, before commencing the argument in favor of any one of these theories, that this multifarious state of the question does not stagger our faith in the speciality of inspiration, and its uncounted value to mankind. For all great spiritual subjects must lie from the nature of the case in indefinite and wavering outlines upon the general mind. Some will draw the circle here, others there. God, Jesus Christ, the soul, duty, truth, immortality, are all subject to this imperfect conception, and conflicting realization, and degrees of faith. Some ask, What precisely is inspiration? How much of it is in the Scriptures, or in particular books? What is the exact limit where the natural ceases, and the supernatural begins? We cannot tell any more than we can say exactly what reason, what genius, is. These points are in litigation as well as that of inspiration. One man says, genius is self-excitement; another, that it is the power of lighting its own fire; another, that it is transcendental intuition; and yet another, that genius is study; it is that in the mind which

studies. But these various definitions cannot destroy our faith in the gift of God called genius, however hard it may be to define it. The doctrine of inspiration, or of supernatural genius, like the rest of its class, is neither definable, nor demonstrable, by a multiplication, but by a moral, table.

Some one has said, that many men are convinced, but few are persuaded; the one being more exclusively a mental, and the other a combined mental and moral state. The fact of inspiration is based on impregnable intellectual grounds, but full justice is not done to it, until it makes its appeal to the deep spiritual experiences and moral sentiments of our being. "Spiritual things are spiritually discerned." "In his light we see light." "He that doeth his will shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God," or not. It is all the better, not the weaker, for this class of truths, that they cannot be decided by Euclid and the blackboard, but address the whole living man through the entire range of his faculties, and put to the test every drop of his manhood, be it in head, or heart, or hand. Give us, we say, these moral questions, which inclose in their discussion education, character, life, conscience, as well as bold thought; for their agitation does us more good than other questions can by their settlement. Welcome the themes that overcome us with a new emotion, break the rusty chains of monotony, and lead us up to a mount of mystic Transfiguration. With human beings in every conceivable attitude toward the Infinite and Eternal, from defiant rebellion to adoring trust, how should any rigid uniformity of belief as to the nature, quantity, or mode of that aid by which God assists his striving children be possible? That must be a poor and small, not a well-nigh boundless question, which can be solved with absolute certainty, can be put into the scales and weighed with a pound of tea, or set down upon the slate and worked out by the rule of three. We make these remarks because the tendency of our material times is to be impatient of moral uncertainties and contingencies, and to call nothing true which cannot be proved, and nothing good which will not pay. Better the reign of the schoolmen again, than that our vast and varied being should be shrivelled up to the materialism

of business, or to the mere mechanics and mathematics of science. The elements which enter into this single question of inspiration are subject to the laws of two worlds. Both poles look towards an infinitude ; one on the side of immortal man, and the other on the side of the Eternal God.

Then, again, in their use as well as their nature, it is all the better that moral problems, such as the one under consideration, do not, like the forty-fifth proposition, annihilate choice, and extort assent. That cannot be the greatest of questions which can be settled in this world. The Supreme Intelligence has not with his revelations sought to override the soul's birthright of freedom, but has tenderly respected the fearful play of the human will, as a privilege incalculably dear and valuable. Inspiration does not become demonstration or infallibility. But the Church of Rome, for example, misunderstands human nature as much as she transcends her own sacred office, when she padlocks the mouth of discussion, and excommunicates all who do not bow in compliance with her own assumed exemption from error. She, a mortal Church, undertakes to do that which the Eternal One himself forbore to do out of his regard to man's moral freedom. But by inflicting a mortal wound upon reason, she has sentenced not man alone, but herself, to irrationality. She decrees that science, literature, and theology shall not move in this moving universe, and the retribution is sure as doom, that she herself shall be tied to the dead past, and die with it. Other bodies of Christians have sought to establish the same eternity for their fragmentary *ism*, and to shut the doors on all progress. But not in such wise has the wisdom from above been given to the family of man. The Infinite does not descend in fire from heaven to consume with his brightness the finite. The truths of inspiration are not refrigerators and silencers, but awakeners, of the intellect and the heart. Nothing is fixed, nothing final ; ends become means, conclusions premises, to lead on and up to higher ends and nobler results, to God, to immortality, to the eternity of eternities. Hence, though above man so high, the Inspired One respects him, and teaches him to respect himself : " I speak as to wise men, judge ye what I say ; why even of yourselves judge ye not

what is right?" The Scriptures are so wonderfully given, as to be an unfailing fount of wisdom, and yet they do not play the tyrant over the nature they were commissioned to redeem. Thus the Infinite gives, thus the finite receives in kind, wisdom, truth, love without end. Virtue under this system is no chain, but a deliverance from all chains, — perfect freedom, perfect joy. While every Christian must say with the deepest humility, "By the grace of God I am what I am"; he will equally recognize that other hemisphere of truth, "Ask and it shall be given you, seek and ye shall find." For the Most High has delegated to his child the awful trust to some extent of self-creation, with its tremendous risks and its superlative happiness.

We would not dogmatize then on the subject of inspiration, or say that our theory is the only one consistent with the best influence of the Scriptures upon the inner and outer life, for we do not believe that the Great God has narrowed to such confines the flowing streams of his spirit. Before whom doth not his light arise? Nevertheless, while we would not dogmatize, we are entirely and earnestly persuaded that wrong notions of the nature, extent, and method of divine aid blight with a killing mildew many of the fair blossoms of Gospel promise. For the exact fact, reality, truth, is always a million times better than any error, however moderate, or seemingly innocent. The distance between error and truth cannot be measured by any arithmetic of ours. Terrible evils in the long range of the future may be coiled up in the serpent eggs of some insignificant falsities of to-day. Good Christians do verily grow towards perfection under every variety of spiritual cultivation; but then the proposition stands for ever that the best method is the best, and that it is to be sought with the whole heart, soul, mind, and strength, as we love our Maker.

But one of the most common and fatal sources of error in regard to inspiration, as to all spiritual matters, is the inclination to run to extremes in opinion, and in no country more than America has this tendency been accelerated by the surrounding forces of society. It is an age of haste. We precipitate ourselves with the momentum of gravitation on whatever we undertake, and

apply our minds to moral and political subjects as fiercely as our axes to the ancient forests. Americans like strong doctrines and strong laws. The medium, which Horace pronounced most safe, is too tame for their exasperated genius. The law of extras and ultras is in the ascendant. Hence, remarkable results follow. They whet the five points of Calvin to their utmost sharpness, or break them off altogether. They raise the revival system to a white heat, and glory in putting their converts through quick. One distinguished divine declares Christianity to be a failure, and another alleviates the irrational dogma of original sin by the supposition of a preëxistent state. Hell has been stormed and carried by assault by one denomination, and the Devil himself unceremoniously reduced to a nonentity. Extreme individualism is crumbling up already broken sects into still smaller fragments, as if division were the only fundamental rule. Fanaticism knows no stop until it invents a new style of Mahometanism, and plants a new Mecca for the faithful in the valley of Utah. Rationalism drives on full tilt until it lands on the cloud banks of Pantheism. "That bourne whence no traveller returns" is now visited twenty times of an evening, and a railroad is not more thronged with comers and goers. The truth is, our young blood boils too hotly in the veins to give us the grace of strong, serene life. We are eager, rush headlong, go the whole, do not discriminate, and prefer smart, brilliant paradoxes to sound, moderate truths that are not startling. Nowhere on the planet does the moral pendulum oscillate with a wider sweep from side to side, because nowhere else are the faculties of the whole man mustered, as here, to the conflicts of politics, morals, science, and theology. These extravaganzas are more hopeful than harmful, for they show that the dead and buried souls of men have heard "the trump of resurrection"; and though they stagger awhile in their grave-clothes, as did Lazarus at the broken tomb, they shall soon hear a commanding voice of the Master, "Loose them; let them go."

To apply these remarks to the matter before us;—we are satisfied, from the best inquiry and observation we can make, that a large number of persons of education and intelligence are out-and-out rationalists. The

exaggerated statement of a writer in a late number of that very able religious newspaper, the *New York Independent*, is that four fifths of the young men of our country, who have so many lectures written for their special behoof, are sceptically inclined. We would qualify this by saying, that we are not hastily to infer that these times are more irreligious than others, for religion may be manifested now in new forms. But for all that, disbelief in some quarters has become a fashion; while, on the other hand, the *Evangelical* churches, as they exclusively term themselves, are insisting in their books and tracts, with even stronger emphasis, on the extreme views of a verbal and plenary inspiration, as if alarmed at the daring invasions of human reason. But a split must come ere long even among them, and already the charges of heresy are hurled as ready missiles from the lofty battlements of more than one of their seats of learning at some peccant man or school. But it is a peculiarity of evil, that it cannot be overcome by evil; only good is a champion equal to that encounter. We would modestly propose to act as mediators between the extreme right and the extreme left, and with our Unitarian views point out what we regard as a more excellent way. We would show the rationalist, that the highest act of human reason is to discern and receive the lessons of the Divine Reason, and that his theory makes revelation an even greater wonder than it was before with the doctrine of miracles. We have not credulity enough to believe in his view, as he says he has not enough to believe in ours. On the other side, we would show the advocates of a verbal dictation, that, so far as the supposed advantages of such a process are concerned, a miracle would still be necessary in every case to guard each mind from error in perusing the book thus written; for the difficulties of language, translation, various education and spirituality, still intervene, and shatter their perfect white light of truth into the sevenfold dyes of the rainbow. The subject must be insured against error, as well as the object rendered immaculate, else their case is not made out. But the discrepancies of testimony confirm the honesty of the witnesses, the varieties of intellectual and moral power charm us as in a work of genius, and the age-long language and world-wide character of the

book set it heaven-high above the range of suspicion that it was the work of a clique or the project of a conspiracy. This theory confounds all simplicity, and destroys all progress. It makes the Old Testament as good as the New, and sets the Gospels on the same level with the Epistle of Jude or the Book of Revelation.

But such is the craving for excitement, the appetite for bold, extreme views, that the moderate man is charged with want of moral courage. Because a man does not startle the world with turning Romanist on one side, or Pantheist on the other, it is gravely suggested that he is deficient in independence. Strong, piquant statements fascinate the world, though the truth may be crucified between them. The main aspect of religious controversies is, that both parties are so wide of the mark, that you care little who succeeds. It is the potsherds of the earth, grinding one against another;—let them grind. How faintly do we as yet see that the truth, the truth, winnow it clean as we can from the chaff of corruptions, is all important, and infinitely valuable, and worthy of a world more of pains, studies, and sacrifices than we make, to secure it without spot or blemish.

Another error and evil in the consideration of this question of Biblical inspiration and authority is, that all its contents have been merged in one volume, the writers all squared by the same standard, the characters all required to be morally perfect, the same Procrustean rule applied as the test to the Song of Solomon and the Sermon on the Mount. No moral perspective has been observed, and no moral imagination has been exercised, in recreating and reconceiving the diversified life of the ancient world. The Scriptures we hold to be inspired, a speciality in literature, an authority in faith, "the law of the spirit of life,"—a book which man, or men, could not have composed, collected, and commissioned—one paramount key-note sounding from beginning to end—unless the writers had enjoyed an illumination superior to what Virgil received in writing his poems, Xenophon his histories, or Shakespeare his plays. But then the inspiration is not one in quantity or one in quality throughout. It has rises and falls, lights and shadows, expansions and contractions, of the divine element. So it is in the works of creation; why

not then in the works of grace? We do not presume to tie up the Infinite Power to one mode of operation in matter; why should we in the yet more boundless realm of spirit? In this characteristic, we submit, the Bible is a natural book, it lies like fair Nature herself, vast, varied, unequal, beautiful, amazing, but holding an infinity of particulars subordinate to the one grand strain. It is a book which steers clear of the common vanity of authors; one in which the writers claim little for themselves, but all for their subject, — are sometimes unknown, — do not override the freedom of man, — at times say they speak as men; but yet a book in which one harmonious and ever-brightening radiance of the religious sentiment shines, from Old to New, from Adam to Christ, and the idea of God, and man's duty to him, sit enthroned and sovereign. It is a history, poem, hymn, sermon, prophecy, argument, dialogue, essay, fiction, tragedy, and its sweep of variety is equal to its steadiness of aim. In such a state of things, to plant a genealogy from Chronicles side by side with the beatitudes, and to attempt to extract as much spiritual nutriment out of the sketches of the rude Philistines and Edomites as from the Epistles to the Corinthians, seems to be a confounding of all moral distinctions. The Canon has always been in discussion; some receiving more and others less; Luther stigmatizing the Epistle of James as an epistle of straw, and Swedenborg rejecting those of Paul from the word of the Lord, as not of the highest authority and spirituality. Now we contend that the spiritual and vivifying power of the Scriptures is not impaired, but enhanced, by this various dealing with its contents, and this miscellaneous condition of the book itself. For man was not made to be most influenced by set rules, but by large principles; not by an abstract creed, confession, or constitution, indited after the manner of a legal instrument, but by a mingling in one volume of all the methods of literary and moral composition. The very state of the Bible, which is objected to as invalidating its authority, is most favorable for awakening attention and inquiry, speaking to different stages of culture, and leaving human freedom inviolate. Each one calls that part best, which is best suited to his state of character. He reads what he affects. He calls that

inspired which to him is inspiring, and he truly judges that the height of the cause must bear some proportion to the depth of the effect. So tenderly has the right of free judgment been respected, and so little has the human mind been overborne by the wisdom from on high, that thus far the major portion of the Christian world is buried in Judaism, sticks to Moses and the Prophets, and has not yet reached Jesus and his glorious company of Apostles, nor heard the angelic song of Glory to God, and peace on earth, nor the parables of the Prodigal Son and the Good Samaritan, nor the prayer on the cross. But by the refining and reforming processes of Christian thought, Judaism is gradually waning from its supremacy, is chiefly valued as it stands connected with the Gospel as its antecedent, and because its records are the treasure-house of such unequalled strains of devotional poetry, golden sentences of wisdom, and sublime prophecies, while the Gospel is daily rising to its just sovereignty, as the effectual instrument for the regeneration of the whole world.

According to the declarations of the book itself, revelation is progressive, the Jewish Scriptures containing a promise, and the Christian a fulfilment of the same. It is remarkable that, while all other nations placed the age of gold in a remote past, the Hebrews dated it in the far-off future. But if there are these gradations in the general system from the law of Moses to the love of Christ, why should it be a thing incredible, that there are degrees of illumination, and that, while to One was given the Spirit "not by measure," to others of the sacred speakers and penmen it was granted as they were fitted to bear it, or as the wants of the time required? Among miracles there may be the greater and the less; why should not the supernatural as well as the natural works of God exhibit variety? We may not be able to tell the precise quantity or quality of inspiration in a given case, as we often find it difficult to determine the exact calibre of a genius, and define the position of a Wordsworth in one age, or a Smith in another; but when we see the sun, we say without hesitation, "There is the king of day," though we may be unable to compute the temperature, number, or essence of his beams. So we say of the Bible, "There is the sun of suns, with light

from beyond the empyrean." Like the mighty luminary of the sky, it has some dark spots on its disc, but when we candidly examine it, and see its incomparable superiority to the sacred books of other nations; when we find it so suggestive of spiritual truth, dealing with the highest relations, duties, and prospects of man as it respects God, the universe, and futurity; when we contemplate the unity and progressive nature of the plan it unfolds, and consider that the agents who were concerned in it lived thousands of years apart, and that the conspiracy to impose upon mankind, if conspiracy it was, ramified over distant generations, and embraced a long line of the greatest and best men who have lived on the earth, with Jesus Christ at the head, and that these men lifted up a light in the world, which would condemn their own characters, if their purposes had been dishonest; and when we reflect upon the results of this work in the world, its duration, its subjection of different ages, nations, and civilizations more or less completely to its controlling spirit, its rich and unceasing development of truth to suit the progress of man, new germs coming out of old seeds; — upon a calm survey of all this ground, we cannot doubt that the Scriptures contain the record of a supernatural revelation from God, mingled indeed more or less with the individualities, and of course the imperfections, of the persons who indited them, but possessing an inspiration and an authority, in addition to their truth, not granted to other books of wisdom and genius. It is philosophical to account for a stupendous effect by seeking for an adequate cause, and we confess we can discover no cause able to produce the effect the Bible has had upon the world except its special and inspired character. No other sacred books have claimed universality, or insisted upon being heard in the forum of conscience and the privacy of the heart, as the unerring guide, as the perfect comforter, as the life-giving inspirer. It is not criminal to neglect to read Plato's Dialogues, — other things may more than make up for that loss; but it is criminal to neglect to read the New Testament, for he who misses that loses a great good, which no library of Alexandria or the Vatican can supply.

It has sometimes been said, in reply to these views,

that the volume does not claim to be inspired, and that it sets up for itself no such superiority as its advocates allege in its behalf. But to this we answer that it does contain a "*Thus-saith-the-Lord*," repeated many times, and that however we may make that phrase a mere Hebraism to express a good impulse, or a dictate of reason and conscience, yet we cannot avoid the conclusion that the conduct of the Prophets and of the Apostles was often regulated by some principle or communication from above, different from the ordinary exercise of the human faculties. If it is replied that these were peculiar men, gifted religious geniuses, aboriginal saints and sages, then we would inquire, why other nations, far more favored by education, position, and native talent, have not been able to produce, we do not say a whole list like that of the Hebrew commonwealth, but even one solitary character of a faith like Abraham's, of a purity like Joseph's, of a wisdom like that of Moses, of devotional song like the Psalms of David, of hallowed imagination like that of Isaiah, of a charity like the love of John, and of a zeal equal to Paul's. The Israelites were once slaves, a stiff-necked people, according to their own candid history, not richly endowed either intellectually or morally, hard to be improved, easy to backslide; yet they supply a cluster of religious leaders, reformers, and idealists, such as the world has never witnessed before or since,—such as not merely one nation, but all nations, cannot match. And when upon such pillars the capital was set,—the Lord of glory,—the Temple of the Most High was perfected on earth. These men speak and act as for God, and not man, and, inspired with a holy spirit themselves, they have become divinely inspiring to others, who have even so much as touched the hem of their garments. The mighty cause has achieved a sublime effect. We rather would say, that it is an eminent feature of this book that it *does* claim a rightful supremacy over the faith and obedience of all men, a kingdom of heaven over all the kingdoms of earth. They *do* speak in character, and they unconsciously assume, when they do not directly express, their right and title to enlighten and guide every man's mind, heart, and conscience before his Maker. Especially in the New Testament, where the plan of thousands of years culminates

to its glorious consummation, the assumption by Jesus and his Apostles of more than human wisdom and authority is plain as the noonday. If this were fanaticism, it combined with it a discretion and a power to substantiate its claims, such as no other fanaticism ever afforded, and such too as no other wisdom of the wise, nor power of the strong, has been able to present. If this were dishonesty, it was coupled with the most remarkable purity of private life, fervor of self-sacrifice, love of the truth, and devotion to the good of mankind. If it is so easy for poets to sing like David, for preachers to argue like Paul, and if it was only a rare religious genius who spoke through the wondrous lips of Jesus, then we would earnestly press the question till it is answered, Why, why has the history of six thousand years been so destitute of such instances? Why cannot vast Christendom now, with its rich experience, its cultured mind and heart, yield one work, or small chapter, or hymn, that shall be read without blame along with the seventeenth chapter of John, or the fifteenth of the First of Corinthians; one that shall carry the weight of spirituality, that shall speak to the depths of the moral nature, announce the duties of a race with so easy and natural a majesty as the beatitudes and golden rules of the Galilean carpenter?

The argument of permanency is a strong one in behalf of an inspired and authoritative revelation. Wise Egypt, polished Greece, and proud Rome, as institutions, exist no more; but homely Judea, as an institution, lives, spreads, emigrates, and lays hold of immortality. Assyrians, Tyrians, and Romans, as races, are obsolete, but the Jews are shone upon by to-day's sun in every latitude and longitude, a quite universal people, hale and hopeful from the battle of three thousand years. The pivot of the argument is here, that the religion and polity of this wonderful people, though superseded by their development and exhaustion in Christianity, were so potent with vitality from their divine origin, that they live on and keep the heart warm and the soul firm from generation to generation, long after the original impulse has been transferred elsewhere. If Judaism, the incipient institution, have such longevity, what will be the duration of Christianity, its full-grown power? The

Veds of Hindooism, the Morals of Confucius, the Oracles of Zoroaster, the Koran of Mahomet, are doomed and declining. None of these have been able to get the least hold upon the Western and ascending races; they are imbedded only in the Eastern and perishing races. The seeds of truth from Judea flying westward have taken root, and the fate of Babylon has not been the fate of Jerusalem, to die out of all memory and affection of mankind. Our domestic Mahometanism of the Great Salt Lake, and its volume of fables, contain the elements of a speedy dissolution. This book, on the other hand, does not die, but lives; is translated into many scores of languages and dialects, and diffused like the leaves of Vallombrosa, east, west, north, south, to the ends of the world. Other systems, propped up by colossal pillars of empire, buttressed and fortified by hoary customs, are waning, and dropping piecemeal; but this volume is young and beautiful to-day, and no thought yet has gone higher than its thought of God, no love has welled up from such depths as its love of God. How shall we speak befittingly of the difference between the two cases, except we say, "The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away, but the word of the Lord endureth for ever"?

Then look at its power of resistance against all the enginery brought to bear upon it in these hard-headed Western nations. All species of scepticisms have taken their turns at it to demolish it; the scorn of Lucian, the philosophy of Hume, the history of Gibbon, the science of France, the freedom of Paine, the rationalism of Germany, the materialism of England and America, but none of these things essentially move it. For they who say of the Church, "We have sapped its life," and of the Scriptures, "Lay that volume on the upper shelf," have not read the papers, and are not living in the living world. Indeed, they have no more apprehension of the zeal, number, breadth, and success of the Christian enterprises now on foot, and wafting their promises to every clime, than a babe has of the powers of language. We well know how even learned men may refine and re-refine their theories, and run off upon a wrong track, until they lose all hold of the realities of the universe, and their arguments and their principles become as base-

less as the fabric of a dream. Is it not so with this class?

We press the inquiry, then, How happens it, if this revelation does not contain the special, inspired truths of the divine and otherwise and hitherto incommunicable reason of the Absolute and Infinite One, that the more the din of appetite and passion is hushed, and the still, small voice of reason is heard, — that the farther and the loftier science and learning swell their triumphs, — that the more arts and inventions are perfected, — and, in a word, the more deeply the human soul enters into the knowledge of the scheme of creation, — the more widely does this scroll fly abroad in the earth, scattering its leaves as from the tree of life for the healing of the nations? If not consentaneous with the higher than human plane of thought, how has so old a book, so new and young a power, permeating with its spirit education and government, art and literature, leading the world's leaders, burning in the lyrics and stories of freedom, and the appeals of temperance, and melting in the accents of peace, and smoothing the seamed and haggard face of society with every lovely feature an angel might wear? That the Bible, asbestos-like, can stand the fire and light of modern investigation, and grow purer and brighter by the searching analysis; that it becomes mistress of the hardest races, and is spread most widely throughout two nations and fifty millions of haughty Anglo-Saxons, and that, unsatisfied with any past achievements, it goes on conquering and to conquer; — these are presumptive evidences of no little weight in support of some remarkable power in these books, unknown before. For we still urge the question upon every reflecting mind, Why have the rebellious Hebrews effected a result to which the philosophical Greeks, the sagacious Romans, the devout Arabs, the contemplative Hindoos, the brilliant Persians, and the moral Chinese, have proved unequal? By what wit or wisdom were they of a provincial state able to accomplish the universal and the eternal kingdom? We know no better solution than the words of Jesus on a like occasion, — "Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight."

This lofty superiority of the Gospel especially has been well expressed by Ackermann, in his work entitled

"The Christian in Plato." He says, as quoted in our own pages:—

"We affirm that, out of the Church of the Lord, there never was a more Christian philosophy than the Platonic. We affirm that Christianity, — which from the beginning lay in the bosom of history, — before its bodily appearance in the person and life of Jesus, had reached a degree of perfection in the minds of thinking men, who were inquiring after divine truth, — and this ideal Gospel was Platonism. In uttering this, we have said the most and the best of him which we can say with a well-grounded conviction. Platonism can never have more than an ideal power and greatness.

"But now if Platonism, by its ideal nature, its religious sublimity, the perfect beauty of its dialectic form, is so admirably fitted to astonish and inspire the thinking, and to win all souls that aspire after the Divine, — how great, how infinitely great, must be the hidden, inward power of the plain words of the humble Jesus, which, though destitute of all that is so enchanting in Platonism, have not only established a mighty Church, but have triumphantly outlasted Platonism, its most venerable and most powerful antagonist! And if, as is well known, in the whole philosophical literature of ancient and modern times, no production can be found which equals Platonism in its æsthetic perfection of form, in profoundness, in wealth of ideas, and in the lofty soaring of a spirit inspired by God, how incomparably high must Christianity stand, since we see the loftiest work of human art and wisdom far beneath it!" *

But in advocating the characteristic of a special inspiration in the Scriptures, we encounter some who reject it on the basis of a mistaken intellectualism. They well-nigh adore, it may be, the specialities of genius, their Goethe, or Carlyle, or Coleridge, but recoil from the specialities of inspiration, the Isaiah, the James, as something contracted and canting. We would suggest to any such, that thought must be incarnated, and that that wisdom is most wise which walks among men and mingles with their life its pure and holy stream. These persons profess, to use one of their own terms, *to ignore* the moral, and look upon mere thought as the chief immaterial power, and for inspiration they write genius. But the point is, that by this step they lose not only the rich spiritual experiences of a believer in a special Chris-

* Christian Examiner for January, 1839, Vol. XXV. p. 384.

tianity, but they do in reality forego the grandest form and the most enduring which intellectual energies can achieve, and that is wisdom. We live in an age and a land where smartness, shrewdness, cunning, and brilliancy of thought are esteemed as the most regal gifts of the mind, and full-orbed and compacted wisdom is put at a lower figure, if it have not the trumpets of praise and self-love to blow its own progress. The leading sceptics, however, as a general rule, have not been the first-class minds, the immortal few who have led the ages, but they have been themselves the thing they most admired in others, ingenious, smart, active, shrewd intellects, but not clothed upon with Miltonic thunder or Newtonian light. The ingenuity, which can invent a new steam-engine, or discover a better method of growing peaches, is not always associated with the other attributes which are requisite to appreciate the lofty, contemplative thought, the impartial wisdom, the august reverence before highest Heaven, the fervent and life-and-death devotion to the truth, and the all-embracing charity, of Him who spake as never man spake. Let those who are disposed to reject revelation, in any form or degree, understand that in doing so they are not taking a higher, but a lower, intellectual, as well as moral position, than the full receiver. The brilliant eccentricities of genius delight us for a time, but they soon become "stale, flat, and unprofitable." Intellectual dynasties rise, flourish, and decline. At certain periods of life we are Byronic, then Carlylian, then Franklinian, then Shakespearian. At certain ages of Pericles, Augustus, or Queen Anne, a special form of literature, shaped by the ideas which have then come to light, is developed, superseded, and in time fossilized into the permanent formations, of which our intellectual earth is built up. But it is the solitary glory of the book of books, God-breathed and life-giving, to arch itself over all ages; and while

"His truths upon the nations rise,
They rise, but never set."

In the wisest intellects of Greece and Rome there is a certain unsoundness; we feel that they have not got hold of the true theory of the universe and intellectually thought the thoughts of God. Hence, upon their works must be written, "*Mene, mene, tekem, upharsin.*" They

are read and will ever be read by a few of the learned, and known as mighty names and spells of power by a larger class of the intelligent, but they exert no real controlling power on the mind of universal humanity. They are not strong, wise, all-sided, and absolute enough to hold the spiritual sceptre of the ages. Before Christianity got fairly under weigh, Platonism and the Aristotelian philosophy for a time quite overbore it, but as it has won for itself a larger freedom, and spread over a greater extent of mind, it has sloughed off these earlier corruptions, and it has, and it will, more and more become itself, in its native spirit of power, and love, and a sound mind, and reign sovereign over the philosophy, as well as the morals, of the world, and inspire art, science, and literature with their inmost wisdom, as much as piety and philanthropy with their justifying and rapturous sentiments. We may rest doubly assured, that no mere feeble work of mind, however elevated in moral tone, could thus master the masters of the mental sphere. The testimony of such imperial natures as Taylor, Milton, Pascal, Locke, Newton, Bacon, Scott, Wordsworth, Coleridge, demonstrates that they felt a deep in the Scriptures calling upon the deep in their own being; or, as the last has expressed it, that in "the Bible there is more that *finds* me, than I have experienced in all other books put together; that the words of the Bible find me at greater depths of my being; and that whatever finds me brings with it an irresistible evidence of having proceeded from the Holy Spirit."

But it is said, What do you gain by your speciality of revelation? You only receive at the most the truth, and the rejecter of inspiration receives as much as that, and more than that is folly or superstition. Is he not as happy in his unbelief, as you are in your belief? Does he not extract as much good from life, and from the great Nature, and encompassing Providence, and solemn Past, as you do? We must reply, that, according to our views, he loses much every way. He misses intellectually no little of the power which the full conviction of faith would give; and he fails of receiving in the heart that peculiar peace and rest of soul, which come from reposing on the promises of God, and feeling that they are his promises, and that, if these fail,

"The pillared firmament itself is rottenness."

The more earnest the faith, the more do we rise from the din and smoke of earth into the stormless calm and azure of heaven's heights. Life then assumes ever a deeper meaning, a tenderer joy, a more heartfelt satisfaction. We pass within the outworks to the life of life; and the zest of youth and spring is again fresh in sense and soul. For in the Scriptures we look at all things from a divine, not a human stand-point, and the joy and strength and love of the Highest pass into us while we are beholding. And then also, in those darker days, when "the house we live in" begins to decay, and "mind and memory flee," how securely does the devotee to this higher wisdom and love witness the desolation going on, and hear the busy carpenters tearing down the scaffolding of his existence, only that his true being may stand out in all its simple beauty and reality! He knows as Plato never knew; and the special wisdom of God hath appeared to bring this life and immortality to light, that, though "his outward man perish, the inward man is renewed day by day"; and "that, if his earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, he has a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens."

As the Scriptures are inspired, so, if faithfully used, do they become life-awakening and soul-inspiring. As they are living, their pupil is living likewise; as they are wise and loving, he is changed into the same image from strength to strength, and from glory to glory. The soul of the world is brutish, and its ear dull of hearing; but when God thunders and lightens out of heaven, men cannot but look up with awe; and when he says, in the still, small voice of love, though it thrills through the soul more than all the thunderings and lightnings of Sinai, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased, hear ye him," they cannot but hear him, and they have heard him more than any or all other teachers for twenty centuries, and they will go on hearing him for ever.

We live, in truth, in an image-breaking age. We are impatient of the past, because forsooth it is the past. We bid it good-by, and seem to care not to meet it again. Our young country stands straining on the lists, champing the bit till it is white with foam, and hot with impatience to thunder forth and scour the plain in still

wider circles of enterprise, and challenge still prouder victories over matter and over men. Young America is a terrible power in the earth. But the voice of the Master, mightier than that of any earthly potentate, shall be able to say, "Peace, Peace!" instead of war, to this Hercules, and he shall sit clothed and in his right mind.

But in order that the inspiration in the Bible may become inspiration in us, we must read, and muse, till the fire burns. The deep book must be read with our deepest mind. "If the well is deep, and we have nothing to draw with, from whence then can we have that living water?" Voltaire confessed that he had not even read the whole of the book upon which he poured out such a merciless scorn. Other infidels have confessed to a similar neglect. We say then, for honesty's sake, give as much study to your theology as you do to your geology or astronomy, your navigation, engineering, or farming, and "hasten slowly" in making up a final judgment on a collection of books so various, so reverend, and so ancient. But if you weigh it carefully, and drink in its spirit, if you read and re-read its Job and its John, and con its moral tables and golden rules, and exult in its songs, and hush your heart with its prayers, and descend depth after depth into the passion and pathos of Jesus, and, after all this spiritual process, you still find it to be only a bundle of Jewish and old wives' fables, then you will have falsified, we do not say the highest yearnings and moral instincts of your own being, but the colossal testimony of the ages, the innermost experience of the wisest men of the Christian ages. He who turns from the book, when he has thus taken it home to heart and head, has not only to disclaim the power of the Scriptures, but he has got a yet harder battle to fight with history, to deny "Christianity as an existing power in the world, and Christendom as an existing fact, with the no less evident fact of a progressive expansion."

But were we never so familiar with the Scriptures, and could we rehearse *memoriter* its psalms and its parables, it is not then by any means to be laid aside, as an old-world book, which we have learned out. The Bible can never be exhausted in that way. If it wears threadbare, it is to the superficial and cold, not the warm-

hearted and the deep-souled. We honor God in matter by going to see his Great and his Fair, and we should honor him in mind by admiring yesterday and to-day and for ever the types of his Great and his Good, the heroes of his earlier, and the saints of his later dispensation. We greet with all hail the spring and the song of birds; we walk in the autumn wood without weariness; and with fresh delight and wonder revisit Niagara and the Alps, the Atlantic and the Rhine. Why should we not commune with the Super-Nature, the Soul of things, with new inspiration? Here is the oldest history, the purest theism, here are the wisest laws, the highest idealities of the spirit-world, and the thoughts of the Son of God. There may be a familiarity which breeds contempt, but there is an intimacy which ripens into love. The use of the Bible promiscuously in schools, to be spelled and murdered by dullards of the form, may be injurious, but its reverential and early reading by childhood must be favorable to clearness of intellectual vision, as well as purity of heart. It may be so read as to enslave, not free the soul; there is such a superstition as Bibliolatry, but when intelligently and reverently studied and digested into the mind, it becomes the charter of the fairest freedom, as well as the'missal of the lowliest faith and penitence. Then we would say, let these holiest words be lisped by children at their mother's knee, and let them circle round the fireside of home, and let them make musical and devout the walls of school-room and capitol. Life is too hard with soul-seducing temptations and crushing afflictions, for us to cast away this balm of the heart, this munition against evil. Verily we cannot estrange ourselves from this wise and mighty counsellor without losing something of the best part of life, and vacating a domain of rich experience, refined intellectual culture, and sweet and happy ideas of God and life and life's future, for the want of which no amount of earthly prosperity and pleasures, though broad as the sea and countless as the sands on its shore, can ever compensate.

Inspiration is not infallibility; else it must be subjective in the mind of each receiver, as well as subjective in the mind of the giver. Inspiration is no chain of compulsion, either to the intellect or the heart. High and

holy as it is, and descending from the heaven of heavens, it falls gently on the soul, as the rain comes from the zenith, nor mars nor breaks a single petal of the tenderest flower. Though coming from above, it is, like all light, discolored by the atmosphere it passes through, and issues to us as Mosaic, Pauline, Johannine, or Petrine. Inspiration is not, again, perfect character, any more than it is perfect knowledge. It is a help, not a substitute, for our natural powers. The men inspired may not always be the men perfect; there is in them likewise the play of the terrible engine of the will. It is as Peter said of the miracle done to the lame man at the Gate Beautiful, so of the world taught, — “Why marvel ye at this? Or why look ye so earnestly on us, as though by our own power or holiness we made this man to walk?” It was not because they were so perfect in character, or so wise in intellect, beyond all other men, that Paul and John spoke as they did, but because they were illuminated from on high that they and all men might become more wise and more perfect. Inspiration casts no discredit on human nature, but it honors and glorifies it rather, that it can be the sharer and congenial recipient and user of so heavenly a wisdom. It has no conflict with, and assumes no haughty precedence of, reason and genius, but, on the contrary, the intellectual kings and princes of the race have bowed their laurelled heads at the foot of the cross, and have felt glorified, not humiliated by the act. In its light they have seen light, and been made strong and beautiful as angels by its life and its love. From its elevated plane of vision, they have spoken with a second-hand inspiration, and have kindled anew the failing hope of the world, and disarmed the problem of despair, the destiny of man.

O wonderful Bible! book of the ages, theme of David and Paul, of Moses and Jesus! a recorded revelation from Infinite Wisdom to frail, ignorant man, sitting in sackcloth and ashes! Egypt is gone, but a race of slaves from her bosom have been the teachers and leaders of the nations. Greece and Rome, too, have had their rise and growth, decline and downfall, and they too are gone; their mythologies and their philosophies have crumbled with their Parthenons and their Pantheons. But this mighty river of thought, the confluence of divers

streams of wisdom on the highest subjects of God and the soul and the soul's eternity, taking its rise in the remotest mountains of antiquity, flowing down with an ever-accumulating volume and power through successive climes and countries, bearing on its broad bosom the freight of untold treasures, — corn from Egypt, gold from Ophir, myrrh and frankincense from Arabia, silks from Persia, oil and honey from Syria, and its own richest wealth from Judah's sacred mount, — still pouring onward with its deepening and resistless tide, as from the hollow of God's own hand, at once giving a refreshing draught to a thirsty soul, and fertilizing provinces and kingdoms with its inexhaustible streams; — what if it have a tinge and a taste from the soils it has passed through, a sediment from the affluence of its tributaries, and a bitter and a sweet from the luxuriant vegetation which adorns its banks and dips into its current? Is it not still the Great River of the waters of life, making glad the city and church of our God, rolling ever onward with its majestic sweep, and carrying with it the innumerable commerce from every kindred and tongue and people under heaven toward the Greater Sea?

A. A. L.

ART. II.—AUSTRALIA, ITS HISTORY AND RESOURCES.*

AUSTRALIA was discovered, almost simultaneously, by the Dutch and Portuguese, in the beginning of the seventeenth century. But the discovery consisted only in the mere ascertainment of the existence of land at sev-

* 1. *Narrative of an Expedition into Central Australia, performed under the Authority of her Majesty's Government during the Years 1844, 1845, and 1846, together with a Notice of the Province of South Australia in 1847.* By CAPT. CHARLES STURT, F.L.S., F.R.G.S., etc., etc., Author of "Two Expeditions into Southern Australia." 2 vols. 8vo. London: T. and W. Boone. 1849.

2. *Three Expeditions into the Interior of Eastern Australia, with Descriptions of the recently explored Region of Australia Felix, and of the present Colony of New South Wales.* By MAJOR T. L. MITCHELL, F.G.S. and M.R.G.S., Surveyor-General. 2 vols. 8vo. London: T. and W. Boone. 1838.

3. *Historical and Statistical Account of New South Wales, including a Visit*

eral points. No account was made of it, either in the way of settlement or exploration; and it was not known whether the several parts seen were points of one continent or were separate islands. The island of New Guinea had fallen under the notice of the Dutch in their commerce with Java, and an expedition was sent by them to explore the former country. The exploring vessel saw the coast of Australia to the south of Endeavor Strait, as it has been since called, on the northeast coast, near the Gulf of Carpentaria. A few months later, Pedro Fernandez de Quiros and Luis Vaez de Torres discovered, while sailing in company, the islands which were called by them Terra del Espiritu Santo (Land of the Holy Ghost), and since called New Hebrides, — six hundred miles eastward of the Australian continent; and after their separation, Torres saw the coast of Australia at its most northern point, now called Cape York. These discoveries were severally made in the first decade of the seventeenth century, from 1605 to 1607. In the succeeding quarter of a century, a large extent of coast was discovered by the Dutch; and in 1642 Tasman discovered Van Diemen's Land.

For all purposes, however, it remained for nearly two centuries as if its existence had not been known. Captain Cook, at about the period of the American Revolution, discovered a large part of the eastern coast; soon after which the English government established a colony in New South Wales, at Port Jackson, and farther discoveries followed on the southern coast of the continent.

Some partial explorations of the interior were made from time to time in a course of years, beginning with the expedition of Mr. Oxley, on the Lachlan River, in 1817, and on the Macquarie, in 1818. Howell and Hume examined some of the country on branches of the Murrumbidgee. In 1829 Captain Sturt followed Mr. Oxley's route on the Macquarie, and extended his examination about one hundred miles farther toward the west; and

to the Gold Regions and a Description of the Mines, with an Estimate of the probable Results of the great Discovery. By JOHN DUNMORE LANG, D.D., A.M., recently one of the Representatives of Sydney in the Legislative Council of New South Wales, etc. Third Edition, bringing down the History of the Colony to the 1st of July, 1852. London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans. 1852. 2 vols. Demi 8vo.

in the next year he explored the Murrumbidgee and Hume. These expeditions were the opening of the book of Australia to the world.

A little more than twenty years ago, the attention of the English government, and of some of its accomplished and enterprising officers, was turned to that country as a field of discovery and exploration. Expeditions were organized for surveying the coasts and exploring the interior. Captains King, Stokes, and others, have presented to the public the information derived from the voyages on the coasts, and Captain Grey has given an account of his exploration of the west and northwest parts of the continent; and Sturt, Eyre, Mitchell, and Leichhardt, of their expeditions into the interior, in several directions. Strzelecki, Lang, Dutton, and Lord Eden have written geographical and historical sketches. Mr. Hodgkinson has published a sketch of the eastern coast, for an extent of three hundred miles from the vicinity of Port Macquarie in about 32° south, to about 27° , including the country about Moreton Bay and Brisbane River. The attention of the local government seems to have been at first excited by the stories of a runaway convict, or, as called there, a bush-ranger, who reported that a great river flowed from high up toward the north out to the sea, southwesterly. These expeditions and explorations have resulted in making the world pretty well acquainted with the new continent, and its geographical character, natural history, and capacities. In extent it exceeds two thousand miles from east to west, or 39° of longitude, from 115° to 154° , and is about eighteen hundred miles from north to south, comprising 29° of latitude, from 10° to 39° . It was found sparsely inhabited by two distinct black races, one resembling the Malay, the other in color and hair having some resemblance to the African negro, but differing in features.

The information which led to the modern series of discoveries in the interior was communicated by George Clarke, a convict, who escaped from the vigilance of the police at Sydney, and lived for a time among the wild natives of the country. These people, it is known to our readers, wear no covering. Their dwellings are merely lodges of ten or twelve feet in diameter and four feet high, into which they crawl and lie occasionally, for

shelter against sun or rain, or for repose, and are made of the branches and twigs of bushes interlaced. Their food is, for the most part, wild game, which is wholesome, palatable, and abundant; though, we are informed by Mr. Hodgkinson, the tribes in the vicinity of the M'Leay River make much account of obtaining a worm, which they find in decaying logs, and which seems to be an important part of their diet. They feed also on snakes, with which the country abounds. They are generally of good disposition, peaceable, and honest. With these people Clarke lived, having painted himself of their color to avoid detection by the police, and traversed regions before unvisited by white men; but being finally discovered and captured by the police, he gave information of the parts of the country which he had seen while he roamed with the natives. He reported that he had been on the banks of a large river to the northwest, called, as he said, the Kindur, by following which in a southwest direction he had reached the sea-coast; on approaching which he saw a burning mountain, called Courada. As he described with correctness the course of some streams to the north, which were already known to the English residents, some credence was given to that part of his story which described the unknown region. Accounts had already been current of a river running northwest from Liverpool Plains, a tract of country behind Sydney, and by the relation of Clarke, the attention of the acting governor, Sir Patrick Lindsay, was drawn to the investigation of the truth of the matter; and an expedition was organized under the direction of Sir T. L. Mitchell, Surveyor-General, for exploring the interior. The magnitude of the anticipated enterprise, and the feelings of the leader in relation to its difficulties and the importance of its results, are so well expressed by him, that we repeat here his language, as a prelude to the opening of this new book of nature.*

"I left Sydney at noon on Thursday, the 24th day of November, 1831, to prosecute my journey, being accompanied for some miles by my friend, Colonel Snodgrass.

"It was not until then that my mind was sufficiently relieved

* Sir T. L. Mitchell's Three Expeditions into the Interior of Australia, Vol. I. p. 2.

from considering the details of my department to enable me to direct my thoughts to the undiscovered country. I had yet to traverse three hundred miles, for thus far the flocks of the colonists extended from Sydney, before I could reach that vast, untrodden soil, the exploration of which was the object of my mission. I felt the ardor of my early youth, when I first sought distinction in the crowded camp and battle-field, revive, as I gave loose, at length, to my reflections, and considered the nature of the enterprise. But in comparing the feelings I then experienced with those which excited my youthful ambition, it seemed that even war and victory, with all their glory, were far less alluring than the pursuit of researches such as these, for the purpose of spreading the light of civilization over a portion of creation as yet unknown, rich, perhaps, in the luxuriance of uncultivated nature, where science might accomplish new and unthought of discoveries, and intelligent man would find a region teeming with useful vegetation, abounding with rivers, hills, and valleys, and waiting only for his enterprising spirit and improving hand to turn to account the native bounty of the soil."

The portion of Clarke's story relating to the Peel and Nammoy Rivers was found by Sir T. L. Mitchell to be correct; but he says that his further account of the large river was a pure invention. He says, "I examined him in the hulk at Sydney," (after his, Mitchell's, return from the expedition,) "and was satisfied that he had never been beyond the Nundawar range" (a range of hills terminating about one hundred miles from a point of the Darling bearing northwest). "This journey of discovery," he says, "proved that any large river flowing to the *northwest* must be far to the northward of lat. 29°. All the rivers south of that parallel, and which had been described by the Barber [Clarke] as falling into such a river as the 'Kindur,' have been ascertained to belong wholly to the basin of the Darling." *

* Mr. Mitchell has either misreported the story of Clarke, or he has suffered himself to lapse into a strange confusion. His report of the story of Clarke is, as before related from his own volume, that, by following the Kindur in a *southwest* direction, he had twice reached the sea-shore. (See *Three Expeditions into the Interior of Eastern Australia*, Vol. I. p. 2.) This, it is now known, may be done. But he discredits the story of Clarke for the reason that he did not find a large river flowing to the *northwest*, (*Ibid.*, Vol. I. p. 139,) which was not stated by Clarke to be the case. He did find a river which flows to the *southwest*, and in that direction reaches the sea, as told by Clarke. This is the Darling, called by the natives, where struck by Mitchell, Karaula, and, it may be, at some other point, Kindur. In describing his course to this river as northwest, it is more than

From that date to the present time, explorations into the interior have been made by Messrs. Sturt, Mitchell, Eyre, and others.

Australia is divided into several provinces or colonies. New South Wales covers an extensive region on the eastern coast, from the extreme north to 35° south, or about fifteen hundred miles, extending westward from the sea-coast in 154° E. to 141° , being over six hundred miles in breadth in its southern portion, and less in the northern.*

South Australia occupies the region extending from 141° E. to 132° E. or nearly or about five hundred miles from east to west; and from 26° to 38° south latitude, though the sea line confines a large portion of it north of 34° and 35° , making its average extent north and south about six hundred miles.

The new colony of Victoria is of small extent, occupying a tract of two hundred and fifty miles from north to south, and five hundred miles from east to west, in the southeastern portion of the continent. It is, however, said to be the best portion as to fertility and agricultural capacity; and was called by Mr. Mitchell, the Surveyor, in reference to this character, *Australia Felix*. The district of Port Philip is included in this colony, and within its territory the most abundant discoveries of gold have been recently made, including the mines of Ballarat and Mount Alexander.

Of the immense tract lying between the sea and South Australia, from 115° to 132° east longitude, and extending across the continent north and south from 15°

probable that a vagabond like Clarke did not mark it quite so accurately without a compass as the Surveyor-General with his instruments. It may be supposed that he followed the Nammoy, whose course to the Darling is very near northwest, while Mr. Mitchell bore farther north. But it was the position of the higher part of the stream relative to the settlement at Sydney, and his course from the Nundawar range to the Kindur, that was, as he stated, to the northwest; not the course of the river, which he said flowed to the southwest. It seems, therefore, not improbable, that Clarke was the first white man who followed the Darling to its union with the Murray, and to the sea. But neither did Mr. Mitchell, in his exploration, seek for a river flowing to the northwest, and this idea is inconsistent with his whole narrative, unless he conceived the Darling to flow thither.

* According to Mitchell, its western boundary is 145° east longitude, and the Darling and Murray Rivers. In the *National Cyclopædia*, the average width east to west is stated at six hundred and thirty miles, length north to south about nine hundred miles, its northern limit being 26° , its southern the ocean. This limit leaves a large territory for another province to the north.

to 35° south latitude, a colony called West Australia has lately been formed within the limits of 30° S. and the coast in 35°, and between the ocean on the west and 120° east longitude. This would give, for area, over one hundred thousand miles, leaving eight or ten times that surface in unorganized territory. Western Australia contains but four or five thousand white, and about two thousand native population.

The settlements have been mostly made in this country within fifteen or sixteen years, with the exception of the convict settlements and the voluntary migrations to the New South Wales colony. South Australia and Victoria have been wholly settled within that period. The town of Adelaide, in the former colony, on the Gulf of St. Vincent, was begun by the erection of the first house in 1836, and in 1847 it was supposed by Captain Sturt to have from eight to ten thousand inhabitants. It is the capital of the colony. Melbourne, in the Port Philip district, was begun about the same time. It is the capital of Victoria, and it has been stated, that in the year 1850, preceding the rush to the newly discovered gold mines, it contained twenty-three thousand inhabitants. There are few instances of such a mushroom growth, even among our Western towns. Adelaide, in 1847, contained twelve places of worship, only three of which Captain Sturt styles churches,—it being contrary to custom, as sanctioned by the Established Church, to call the houses of Dissenters churches, probably from respect to the old Dissenters, who themselves, some two or three centuries ago, willed to call them meeting-houses. The great tract of Western Australia is, we believe, as yet nearly unsettled, including half of the surface of the continent. New South Wales in 1848 contained 220,474 people, including the Victoria colony, of whom 4,015 were convicts. In 1850, the estimated population of Victoria was sixty thousand. The whole population of the continent at this time may be from four hundred thousand to half a million.

The interior portion of the continent explored by Captain Sturt, comprising four degrees of longitude, from 138° to 142° E., and eight degrees of latitude, from 24° 30' to 32° 30', is a desert, which for extent, sterility, aridity, and calidity is perhaps unsurpassed. It is, for the

most part, a plain of dry, naked sand, destitute, in tracts, of grass; in others, having scattered tufts of coarse herbaceous vegetation; and in some, covered with a scrubby growth of low bushes. Properly, there are no rivers, that is, no living, permanent streams. Except the Murray and the short streams rising in the coast ranges, this is the case throughout the continent. But there are beds of rivers, or rather gullies, which serve to drain the country after the rains, and which at other times have their channels alternating in pools of water separated by long interspaces of dry ground. Of this character are not only the creeks, but the large rivers, as the Darling. It is the general hydrographic feature of the country. Captain Sturt's party were frequently three or four days without water, had to traverse over one hundred miles to obtain a smack from a small water-hole of muddy, sometimes of putrid water, and lost several horses by death from thirst. They met a party of natives having their tongues swollen from the same cause. The usual summer range of the thermometer was about 117° to 120° in the shade; on one occasion it marked 137° , the highest scale of the instrument, and, still expanding, burst the tube.

On his last attempt to proceed northward, in October, 1845, Captain Sturt came to a stop and turned homeward, at fifty miles from his last watering. He had travelled a great part of the day and night on his return, resting only from one o'clock A. M. till dawn, in which tramp one of his horses fell dead late at night, and at eleven the next day he arrived at a place where he hoped to find water in the holes which he had made to drain what might be on the surface. No water was there; but Mr. Stuart, one of the party, poked his fingers into the mud, and moistened his lips with them.

Such is the detail day after day of Mr. Sturt's exploration in the desert. His notes are, therefore, principally of the thermometer, the sand, and the drought; and he descants on every page of his unsuccessful searches after a creek or a water-hole. This makes the burden of his volume. It required an iron resolution to persevere against these appalling dangers and difficulties, in the manner and to the extent which Captain Sturt and his stout-hearted companions did. Of such a character

seems to be nearly the whole territory of the colony of South Australia, with the exception of only a small strip adjacent to the coast. Between Adelaide and the Murray, however, is a tract well suited to cultivation, and which is of great value for its minerals, chiefly copper and iron.

In 1843 the first discovery of copper was made. From this period, which was one of great depression in the pastoral and agricultural business of the colony, and which circumstance gave a great stimulus to enterprises in mining, mine after mine of copper and lead was constantly brought to light. In 1844 or 1845 the Burra-Burra mine was discovered, from which, in 1847, had been sent weekly to port four hundred and fifty tons. The amount that had been received up to December of that year was ten thousand tons, and the shares, originally £ 5, had risen to £ 160, or from \$ 25 to \$ 800. "The whole of the mountain chain," Captain Sturt says, "is a mass of ore from one end to the other, and it is impossible to say what quantity or how many of the richer metals will ultimately be found in a country through which the baser metals are, without doubt, so abundantly diffused." On the 23d of October, 1847, three dividends were declared and paid, on the Burra-Burra, amounting to 200 per cent. on the subscribed capital, and the credits of the association were, on the 30th of September previous, £ 104,694 4s. 8d.

Captain Sturt found the natives very peaceable, almost without exception, and mostly forward in offering kindness. Mr. Mitchell also met with little show of hostility. One tribe on the Darling, about one hundred miles above its junction with the Murrumbidgee, displayed a very decidedly hostile disposition, and were about commencing an attack, but were easily put to flight. Mr. Allan Cunningham, botanist, having strayed from the party, was murdered by other natives on the Bogan, and two of Mr. Mitchell's expresses were also killed in the same region. From these occurrences it might be doubted whether the pacific behavior of these people at other times was the effect of a natural disposition, or was induced by fear or policy. Mr. Mitchell says of them: "My experience enables me to speak in the most favorable terms of the aborigines, whose degraded position in

the midst of the white population affords no just criterion of their merits. The quickness of apprehension of those in the interior was very extraordinary, for nothing, in all the complicated adaptations we carried with us, either surprised or puzzled them. They are never awkward; on the contrary, in manners and general intelligence they appear superior to any class of white rustics that I have seen. Their powers of mimicry seem extraordinary, and their shrewdness shines even through the medium of imperfect language, and renders them in general very agreeable companions." (Vol. II. p. 334.) As to their temper, however, Mr. Mitchell considered it bad. He said that no kindness could propitiate them. The natives, in most parts of New South Wales which were seen by Major Mitchell, wear a narrow belt around the loins, with a pendant before and behind, and a bandage or fillet around the head. But many of the tribes have nothing artificial about them. If we remember correctly, neither Captain Sturt nor Mr. Hodgkinson speaks of these or any articles of dress or decoration. They paint the body red, but this seems only for occasions, and make ridges, or raised lines over them, in the skin. Their weapons used in war or the hunting of animals are the spear, and a singular weapon called bomareng, which, as described by Mitchell and Hodgkinson, is a thin curved stick two feet four inches in length, larger in the middle than at the ends, which can be thrown by a skilled hand with a rotatory motion, so as to rise upon the wind, and in a crooked direction, toward any given point, with great precision, and to return within a yard or two of the thrower; or, by first striking the ground near him, to bound, so as to hit, at a given distance, *en ricochet*, any object behind a tree. This weapon is also similarly described by Mr. Hodgkinson and Mr. Howitt. The personal appearance and dwelling, and habits of life of these people, have been already casually adverted to. The following statement made by Dr. Lang must suffice for the conclusion of this summary notice of the natives; only remarking, however, that some discrepancies exist in the different accounts of these people, probably owing to the fact that there are two distinct races, and to the different periods of observation, having relation to their longer or shorter intercourse with the whites. Dr. Lang relates to

us that Captain Philip, the first Governor of New South Wales, endeavored to conciliate the natives, and to induce them to adopt the habits of civilized life. He domesticated in his family one of them, named Bennilong, a man of some consequence in his tribe, who so far acquired the habits of the English that he acquitted himself at the Governor's table, according to the report of those who sat with him, "with the utmost propriety"; Captain Philip carried him with him on his return to England, and introduced him among his acquaintance as an interesting specimen of the Australian native. But on going back to his native land, Bennilong threw off his European dress, and rejoined his tribe as a naked savage, apparently unimproved, in the least degree, by his converse with civilized man.

It has been already stated, that copper, lead, and iron had been found in South Australia in 1845 or 1846. Subsequently, and previous to 1850, several specimens of gold in fragments of quartz veins were found in the Blue Mountains in New South Wales, north of Sydney, with copper and lead. And Mr. Phillips, a Cornish miner from England, discovered gold in the detritus of the mountains north of Adelaide, in the vicinity of the Burra-Burra mines. The more important discoveries of the precious metal, however, did not immediately follow these revelations. In 1851 some localities where it was more abundant were found in the region of New South Wales contiguous to Sydney, since which others have followed in rapid succession, in the more southern parts of that colony. But the richest plazas have been discovered in the colony of Victoria, or Australia Felix, in which, at several points, gold has been obtained in great quantities. Discovery followed discovery in rapid succession; and as some of the later findings proved the better, the most extravagant expectations were cherished of obtaining wealth. When rich discoveries were made in the neighborhood of Sydney and the Macquarie River, the town of Melbourne became so much reduced in population that it was feared it would be absolutely deserted. But subsequently far richer spots were found in Victoria, and in the immediate vicinity of the city itself.

A writer in the *London Quarterly Review* for September, 1850, says that the English Home Government

had resolved not to enforce the English law of royalties, that is, not to exact of the digger a tithe or other portion of the treasure which might be found. But, according to late statements, it seems that a licensing system has been established, by which the digger is compelled to pay a license fee, amounting to £3, or fifteen dollars, a month, equal to one hundred and eighty dollars a year. This is exacted by a law of the local government; by what authority does not appear, but probably by virtue of that unlimited power which legislators frequently suppose to belong to their office, even in this country.

The formation of the gold-bearing tracts in Australia is described as similar to the gold regions of Siberia and California; and consists of the palæozoic, or older limestone rocks, with talc-schist and slate, cut through, as expressed, by granitic, felspathic, and quartzose rocks; and when first made known in England, Mr. Murchison expressed his opinion that where these occurred it might be expected that gold would be found.*

The quantity of gold obtained from the several diggings, during the last year, has been stated to be very large. We shall, before closing, present an authentic statement on this head, which seems to show the accounts from less reliable sources to be somewhat exaggerated. The principal seat of this wealth is in several localities of the district of Port Philip in Victoria colony, partly very near to Melbourne, and partly lying at the distance of one hundred miles from that city; and in the Bathurst and Wellington districts, west of Sydney, in New South Wales. From this source a very extensive commerce has, at once, sprung up in Great Britain and in this country. The former small number

* The expression "cut through," as used by the geological writers in describing this feature, is not, it seems to us, strictly scientific. The granitic and quartzose rocks do not, in fact, cut through the others, but, according to the geological theory, were formed first, and the others superposed, or afterwards placed on them. Neither does the idea appear philosophical, that gold exists only where the two formations unite. If, as is undoubtedly well proved, quartz is the matrix of gold, it is difficult to conceive why it should not be found in that rock under any situation and circumstances, as well as at the point where the transition, or later series of rocks, lay upon the quartz. Indeed, as we understand, the hypothesis does not exclude the idea of the *existence* of gold in quartz *anywhere*; but goes only to the extent, that it is not *accumulated* in considerable quantities, except where there is evidence of some posterior disturbing action.

of ships has so increased, that it was said recently that more than a hundred vessels were advertised at Liverpool, at one time, to sail for Australia. In this city, at about the same time, seven or eight first-class clipper ships were advertised, and a large number in New York. It has been stated that forty-nine vessels of all classes sailed from Boston for Australia in the year ending September 1st, 1850. They are mostly advertised as packet lines. At the same time, several merchants have gone out from our ports to establish commercial houses there; all betokening the commencement of a new and very active trade.

The export trade of the country, however, must be limited to the metals, not only at the present time, but in all time. Our outward ships may do a brisk, and perhaps a profitable business in carrying provisions and Yankee notions to the miners, but it is manifest that nothing can be brought away in return except metals, if the old arithmetical problem is still true, that, if you take nothing from nothing, the remainder is nothing; and it is equally demonstrable that the outward trade cannot be an increasing one, beyond a certain very narrow limit. Of all the known parts of the world, this continent is the least favored in natural resources. From the explorations made under authority of the English government it has been ascertained that, in the whole of the eastern and southern parts of the continent, the productive land is included within a strip of about one hundred and fifty miles of coast; except in the colony of Victoria, where it spreads to two hundred and two hundred and fifty miles. Beyond these lines, the explorations of Captain Sturt and Sir T. L. Mitchell and others, extending upwards of five hundred miles into the interior in various directions, resulted in the discovery only of the most inhospitable, uninhabitable, and horrible deserts. Every day's travel was at the peril of life, from the absence of water. The soil, principally decomposed sandstone, is incapable of production; and, allowing for an occasional oasis, it may be assumed that this desert, unmatched in the world for sterility, includes an area of twelve hundred miles in one direction, and something exceeding that in the other. It must result, not only that nothing can be produced for exportation, to any ex

tent, but also that the population must be so limited as to forbid the idea of very extensive importations. In 1848 the imports into New South Wales were valued at £ 1,556,550, or \$ 7,782,750 ; the exports at £ 1,830,368, or \$ 9,151,840. Of the latter £ 1,240,144 was wool, about two thirds of the whole. This article must always go to Great Britain. Western Australia imported in the same year to the amount of £ 45,411, or about \$ 227,000, and exported £ 29,598, or about \$ 148,000. The whole import of the country may have been about ten millions of dollars, and the export nearly as much.

It is true, both Major Mitchell and Mr. Hodgkinson describe portions of the New South Wales colony as highly fertile and beautiful; yet the former says that throughout this colony "one third probably consists of desert interior plains, *one fourth of land available for pasturage or cultivation*, and the remainder of rocky mountain, or impassable or unproductive country." The whole area of the continent may be stated at 2,400,000 square miles. The tract included in Major Mitchell's description is about 360,000, of which one fourth, or 90,000, is available. And this tract, being the best of the continent, of which about one half is desert, must contain, we think, one third, at least, of all the available land of the country, which would give us for the whole of the land that may be used for pastoral or agricultural purposes, on the whole continent, 270,000 square miles, equal to one ninth part only of the whole surface.

This consideration, that the outward commerce must be limited chiefly to the metals, and also the great interest which has been excited lately in this remote, forbidding, and hitherto disreputable land, in consequence of the gold discoveries, and the high expectations raised thereon, perhaps require at our hands a rather more extended and detailed notice of the gold regions.

The first discovery of gold existing in considerable quantities, so as to make the search for it an object of general industrial pursuit, was on the upper waters of the Macquarie River, in New South Wales, west from the port of Sydney, which has been known as the Bathurst Gold Field, comprising the country surrounding the town of Bathurst, about one hundred miles from

Sydney. From Mr. Lang we learn that it includes six tributaries of the Macquarie. The discovery occurred in 1851, little more than two years subsequent to the California discovery, and in the course of the year such was the rush to the mines, that the town of Melbourne, in the Port Philip district, became reduced nearly one half in population, or from 23,000 to 12,000, in that and the next year. The names of the streams are the Summerhill, Turon, Louisa, Meroo, Coodgegong, and Winburndale. Sutter appears to be a peculiarly fortunate name in the recent gold history; the discovery first made in California having been on the lands of Mr. Sutter, and some valuable deposits of the metal, among the early discoveries in Australia, were on lands owned by the same name on Winburndale Creek. The gold region is in a mountain district. Summerhill Creek is 3,010 feet above the sea, and Mount Canobolas 4,610 feet. Subsequently, in 1851, very rich deposits were found in Victoria, in the vicinity of Melbourne and at Mount Alexander, which drew off the miners from the first discoveries; but many have since returned. Beside the Bathurst Gold Field first mentioned, there were three other principal places in New South Wales where the gold was abundant. They were the Southern, or Araluen diggings, the Tuena, or Abercrombie River diggings, and Hanging Rock, or Peel River diggings. The Turon River, a branch of the Macquarie, is considered the richest deposit of the Bathurst Gold Field. The town of Bathurst is situated on the left bank of the Macquarie, at the elevation of 2,200 feet above the level of the sea, about forty miles to the north-west of which town gold in quantity was first found.

The precious metal has been also found to the North of the Bathurst field, at the head-waters of Clarence River, in New England. The whole range of what has been termed the Australian Alps, (which is the watershed of the eastern coast and the Darling River,) consisting of slate disposed perpendicularly, and traversed or cut through, as expressed, by granite or quartz, is supposed to be highly auriferous: the metal having been found at Wide Bay, $25\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$ S. lat., and at Mount Alexander and other places as far south as Melbourne, in latitude 38° .

The following account of the discovery of gold in

Australia is extracted from Dr. Lang. After quoting from Mr. Dana, naturalist of the Exploring Expedition of the United States, a description of the geological formation of the gold region of California, Dr. Lang proceeds : —

“ This description of the auriferous rocks of California might almost be taken for a description of the gold-bearing regions of Australia. But the discovery of gold in California was made by the merest accident, in the year 1848, and it was that accident that subsequently led to the discovery in Australia. During his residence in New South Wales, Count Strzelecki had intimated his belief that the Australian Andes were auriferous, and had even mentioned indications of gold as having been observed by himself to the westward of the Blue Mountains ; but the impression upon his own mind must have been very slight and transient, as he does not allude to the subject in his book. I have already observed that Dr. Leichhardt, when residing at the German Mission Station at Moreton Bay, in the year 1844, previous to his departure for Port Essington, had recommended the missionaries to search for gold towards the sources of the ‘ Brook Kidron,’ on which their station is situated, as he thought it highly probable that they would find the precious metal in that locality.* And the Rev. W. B. Clarke, a geologist of the highest standing in New South Wales, had repeatedly expressed his belief and conviction that the country to the westward of Bathurst was auriferous. Nay, small quantities of gold had repeatedly been found in the western country, especially by a Scotch shepherd of the name of McGregor ; and a nugget of three and a half ounces had been forwarded to the local government by an individual who proposed to open a mine, if he could obtain certain privileges of the government beforehand. None of these circumstances or statements, however, had made the slightest impression upon the public mind, or contributed in any way to the actual result.

“ Among the numerous body of adventurers who crossed over from the Australian colonies to California, on the report of the discovery of gold in that country, was Mr. Edward Hammond Hargraves, a highly intelligent and respectable colonist, who had resided for some time in the western interior of New South Wales. During his stay in California, Mr. Hargraves was employed, like most of the other Australian adventurers, in mining, and in the course of his researches with that view, he was greatly struck with the striking resemblance of the California

* Several degrees north of the Bathurst Gold Field.

gold country generally to a region with which he was quite familiar in New South Wales, and he naturally concluded that, if gold was found so extensively in such a country on the eastern coast of the Pacific, it would, in all probability, be found in a similarly formed country on the western. The more he saw of the country, the more strongly was this idea impressed upon his mind, till he resolved at length to return to New South Wales, to ascertain whether it was well founded. He did so accordingly, and on the 12th of February, 1851, he succeeded in discovering gold in Australia, in the very locality in which he was so strongly persuaded it would be found, namely, in the Lewis Ponds and Summerhill Creeks, and in the Macquarie and Turon Rivers, in the districts of Bathurst and Wellington. Mr. Hargraves makes no pretensions to geological science. He is merely a practical miner; but his powers of observation are evidently of the first order, and his conduct throughout the whole affair does him the highest credit. The local government presented Mr. Hargraves, at his own suggestion, with £ 500 to cover expenses, in part payment for his important discovery; referring it to the home government to determine what his proper remuneration should be, and in the mean time appointing him a Commissioner of Crown Lands to *prospect* in the gold regions."

Though some large masses of the metal have been found, as the lump which was picked up on Louisa Creek, in the commencement of the search, weighing 106 pounds, and though the public has been recently astonished with large stories of the amount of gold taken, which, according to some newspaper statements, exceeded the yield of the California diggings in 1852, yet it appears from authentic statements to have amounted to only from a little over one dollar to five dollars daily in the beginning. Mr. Hargraves, writing to the Colonial Secretary on the 2d of July, 1851, states the average on the Turon to have been from 15s. to 20s. a day to each man. Mr. Hardy, on the 8th of July, states it at the same, in the same locality. It is true, Mr. Hargraves, writing again to the Secretary on August 18th, says, "No part of California which I have seen has produced gold so generally, and to such an extent, as Summerhill Creek, the Turon River, and its tributaries"; but on the 9th of September he states the average obtained on the Abercrombie River at from 7s. to 10s. daily. And of the product of the Araluen diggings he says, on the 29th of September, the diggers are "earning on an

average 5s. per diem. Some few are making 10s., and a solitary case or two of 20s." And Mr. Hardy, the Chief Commissioner, in a letter of the 19th of October, says, "With respect to the production of gold in the Araluen Gold Field, I am of opinion, after a very careful inspection, that it is equal in productiveness to any other part of the colony, and but the commencement of a much more extensive digging than any in the Bathurst district." The average earnings he puts at not less than £ 1 (or five dollars) a day each. We have not the tables of the California results, but it seems to us that this must be much below the mark of those diggings.

The aggregate product, also, we believe to be less than that of California. Mr. Lang states that, up to the 26th of July, 1852, which includes over fourteen months from the commencement of the digging, there had been exported from New South Wales gold to the amount of £ 1,759,745, and the export from Port Philip had then, by the latest accounts, been about £ 2,400,000, or upwards of four millions sterling from both colonies (less than \$ 22,000,000). The yield of the Port Philip diggings, though absolutely much larger than those of New South Wales, was in fact much less per head, there having been 50,000 diggers in the Port Philip diggings, and only 15,000 in the others. The discovery was made, in the Port Philip district, of the Ballarat Gold Field in August, 1851, and of the Mount Alexander soon after. They had not, therefore, been worked quite a year at the time just named.

From this view of the productiveness of the gold fields of Australia, as compared with those of California, taken in connection with the license fee or excise of \$ 180 per annum, and the difference between the ordinary rate and amount of taxation in England and America, it would appear to be an error of judgment that should lead an American to try his fortunes in the Australian mines rather than in California. The acquisition is also less secure in Australia. The old convict population sends out swarms to those points where the successful miner is most to be found, and the last chapter of his gold history frequently records the fact, that all his gold has been appropriated by a more fortunate gold-seeker, operating in the pocket or the chest.

The observation of some travellers has discovered, or surmised, that the continent is of recent formation. It is represented as presenting for the most part a flat, sandy surface, little elevated above the sea, nearly destitute of vegetation, interspersed with some isolated mounds or elevations, and having marine shells and marks of the subsidence of water upon it. "My impression," says Captain Sturt, "when travelling the country to the west and northwest of the marshes of the Macquarie, was that I was travelling a country of comparatively recent formation. The sandy nature of the soil, the great want of vegetable decay, the salsolaceous character of the plants, the appearance of its isolated hills and flooded tracts, and its trifling elevation above the sea, severally contributed to strengthen these impressions on my mind."

The natural history of this country has much that is altogether peculiar to itself and different from the rest of the world. The Mammalia comprise only fifty-three species, as stated in the Penny Cyclopædia, Art. "Australia," of which forty-three, or about four fifths, are Marsupialia, or of that tribe who carry the young in a pouch. The whole of these fifty-three species are peculiar to the country. The ten species not of the Marsupialia are two of the Cheiroptera, or bats, one of the Carnivora, a dog, five Rodentia, and two Edentata. The Ruminantia, or ruminating animals, are wholly wanting. The prevalence of Marsupialia, almost amounting to a monopoly of the mammalian department of land animals, forms a strong peculiarity in the zoölogy of the country; five of the rat and weasel kind, one dog and two bats, and the two amphibious Edentata, duck-billed, — whose rank as Mammalia seems not quite settled, — being all of the class that are not marsupial, except those inhabiting the sea. In the department of ornithology Australia is remarkable for the absence of all the gallinaceous birds, and for the presence of that "*rara avis in terris*," the black swan. This is rather smaller than its white congener, which has had the honor of being sung by the poets, and has a longer neck, and, it is said, more grace, than the white. The emu is a gigantic bird, whose wings will not sustain a flight, whose flesh is of very agreeable flavor, and forms a luxuriant viand greatly esteemed by the English set-

tlers; it is mentioned by Malte-Brun as a species of casowary. Mr. Howitt mentions the soldier-bird (it does not appear whether the same as the flamingo), a small water-hen, and he and others many varieties of the pigeons and most of the birds known in England. He mentions also a late-found sloth. In fact, the classification given of Mammalia above must be taken only as partial, including such animals as were known at the time, but not all of the class on the continent.

The botany of the country is not less peculiar in its organization than the zoölogy. A large proportion of the genera among its plants, and indeed even some entire natural orders, are confined to this continent, or do not extend beyond the neighboring islands. Several species of the *Acacia* have been well known for years among us, having been domesticated in our green-houses and gardens. This is the most numerous genus of the Australian vegetable kingdom. The *Eucalyptus* also includes many species. Some of these, which are mentioned by travellers under the common name of gum-trees, are of a large size, being one hundred and fifty feet in height, and from thirty to forty in girth. The *Callitris*, a species of pine (or, as described, a genus), is represented as a very stately and beautiful tree; and there is one called the celery-topped pine, whose leaves resemble, in appearance and in taste, the plant from which it is so named. A singular tree, called the grass-tree, appears like a boughless stump, but bearing at its extreme topmost point a tuft resembling long grass. In New South Wales, from Sydney to Moreton Bay, near the sea-coast, Hodgkinson, Mitchell, and others mention the cedar, rosewood, fig-trees, nettle-trees, and plum-trees on the bottoms, and black-butt, myrtle, turpentine, corkwood, and mahogany in the mountains; also ironwood, light-wood, sassafras, Australian tamarind, box, Australian palms, and brush fig-tree. These are mostly different from trees bearing the same names in other countries. The cedar is distinguished into red and white; but both are wholly different from trees having those designations among us. Both are deciduous, and of large size. The Australian tamarind is not the same as the Indian tamarind; and the mahogany and rosewood differ from the woods known to us under those names. Many of these, and others, are peculiar to the country.

After a residence in Victoria, or Australia Felix, near to the city of Melbourne, three months, Mr. Richard Howitt thus describes this part of the country in a letter to his brother: "We have been here a quarter of a year, and ought by this time to know something of Australia Felix. Whence it derived this felicitous name, God knows, and Major Mitchell; but certainly not from the nature of the country. It is however deservedly called *the Land of Promise*, performance being yet in speculation. The land has grown gold to those who have bought and sold it, almost, at present, its only growth. It is neither a land of rivers and springs of water, nor does it overflow with milk and honey; honey there is none, and milk is 6d. per pint."

Mr. Howitt represents the weather as hot and dry in the extreme in summer, in winter cold, with great and sudden changes. The soil, he says, is not so good as was represented to them in England. "Many who came out with us are dissatisfied; some will return as soon as they have realized their expenses out to England."

To sum up the characteristics of Australia, as found from English writers having a most intimate personal acquaintance with the country described, the soil is, about eight or nine tenths, utterly unsuited to cultivation and to the wants of man; and is greatly deficient in that first of all necessary things, water. Its climate is uncomfortable from the excess of heat, and from sudden and extreme vicissitude. It has been mentioned that Captain Sturt's thermometer rose to 137° and burst. He says also, "In the morning we sat by a fire to warm, and in six hours the thermometer stood at 104°." Mr. Howitt says the heat was so great, and the atmosphere so dry, that "books have their covers curled up as if you had been reading by a hot fire" (p. 103). This was in early summer, December 7th, and on July 3d, or mid-winter, the thermometer was as low as 25° in the morning, with ice, and at noon, so sudden and intense was the change that it was up to 85° (p. 219), which is extremely warm summer weather with us in Massachusetts. A change of 60° in six hours seems to us utterly incredible, complaining as we do of our changeable climate, and rarely having half that degree of change in twenty-four hours. Mr. Howitt further says (p. 222): "Cold weather there

is intensely cold, principally in the winter nights. In the Australian day and night in winter are often concentrated the four seasons of the year; it is deep winter a little before the dawn, spring breathes about you about nine or ten o'clock in the forenoon, fierce summer scorches you in the afternoon, and the gloom of evening comes down upon you with an autumnal feeling." Though its agricultural capacity is small, as has been shown, its mineral resources are very good. Captain Sturt informs us that the mines of iron are productive, and those of copper and lead very abundant. Its coal must lay undisturbed for want of a market. The great wealth of the country is its gold, in the abundance of which it is not exceeded in the world, so far as known, unless it be in California. This is, at least, the present appearance. Though, as gold is usually found most abundantly on or near the surface, it is not yet certain to what amount it may be obtained; or whether it will hold out correspondently with present expectation.

W. J. A. B.

ART. III. — MEMORIES.

A SELF-CONFERENCE AT THREESCORE.

A GREAT deal has been written and said of the pleasures of memory; a thousand times more has been felt of its pains. I have sometimes thought, not only that its pains greatly exceed its pleasures, but that it can hardly be said, in serious strictness, to have any thing in it that deserves to be called by the name of pleasure. My mind has been strongly impressed with this idea for a long time; — not as if this were something peculiar to my temperament, or attaching itself to my time of life, but as if the fact was one of general experience, and would be found true, not merely on the ground of personal considerations, but from an attentive examination of that faculty itself. It would be better, so far as mere enjoyment is concerned, — mere enjoyment, — if we had no such power; if there were no dark background behind us, from which thoughts and events steal forth into

the light of their dependent and retrospective life ; if the past could *be* past and fall into utter forgetfulness ; if we could exist from hour to hour only, provided the present could be beautifully filled, and the future could shine towards us in hope and desire. I am aware that such a provision for us is scarcely conceivable, except in the wildest fancy. I am sensible that it would be a mean thing to desire such an enjoyment, because it would cut us off from the appointed happiness of an intellectual and moral nature. We would not forfeit that. We should rather try to live up to our noble necessity. We must float on between the two eternities, as God has decreed, though it is a solemn consciousness that we must. I wish to look a little more closely at this endowment of Memory, with single reference to the point now indicated. Its sorrows,—how gloomy, how disturbing, how desperate, how deathly ! Its pleasures what hollow ghosts and mocking shadows !

It seems to me, as I meditate, that Memory has three distinct offices ; if I ought not rather to say, that it is to be looked at from three distinct points of view. First, there is what I would call the Constitutive Memory. It is that which is elemental in us, a part of our intellectual composition, mingled with our other capacities, and thus constituting us what we are. The second is the Pictorial or Imaginative Memory ; that which restores to us vividly the scenes of a former time, so as to make us live in them again. The third is the Reflective Memory, that which does more than behold afresh the figures that Time has swallowed up, and converse with them as if they still existed ; which carries with it also the reason and moral judgment to bear directly upon them.

With regard to the first of these, the memory considered simply as a component part of our being, it leaves untouched all question either of pleasure or pain. It has no more to do with the sensibilities than the understanding has. It is a province of the human mind, and nothing further. As such, it is so indispensable, that, without it, no course of regulated conduct could be pursued, and no process of reasoning of any kind would be possible. The simplest sum in arithmetic could not be computed, nor the plainest logical conclusion drawn, nor a consistent step taken forward in the world. It min-

gles with all our crowding thoughts. It guides all our judgments. It retains for us and is continually repairing such knowledge as we possess, and leads forward to more knowledge. Though it does not create our personal identity, it manifests that identity. It is the only voucher we have that we continue to be the same persons we formerly were. On this account, it is of immense moral importance. But, thus far, it only shows its extreme value to us in our intellectual and practical life. It does not yet profess to be a treasury of sensations, whether of one kind or another.

In its second aspect, as pictorial or imaginative, Memory begins to enter the realm of sensibility, and touches some of the coarser springs of pleasure and pain. I say some of the coarser, because it is connected as yet only with that faculty of the mind which spontaneously and often unconsciously repeats and reproduces the subjects of a former experience. It partakes of the nature of dreams and visions, and can hardly be said to be more substantial than they. Sometimes of its own accord, but oftener involuntarily, it calls up events or scenes that were once delightful to us. According to the vividness of these paintings, and almost in direct proportion to our forgetfulness of their real nature, they affect us with a lively sensation of enjoyment. Some men love to live upon this old, perished capital, and in this dreamy way. But if they do, it is because they are unwilling to remember that they are bankrupts, and that they have something to be employed about awake. It is from mere sluggishness, as of one who prefers to lie in half-slumber, divided between fantasies and oblivion, rather than rouse himself thoroughly, and bathe in fresh water, and see the sun rise, and dress himself for the occupations and earnest service in which he is to find his real joy. So much for these images when they are of an agreeable kind, — when they are the true and undistorted copies of past enjoyments. There is no genuine life in them, and they impart no life. They are but idle phantasms. But these images will not always be thus pleasant. They will be much the reverse very often. And in that case they are not merely shadows, with their sides colored by the mock hues of reality, but altogether spectral and ghastly. They are so many supernumeraries added to the amount of disagreeable impressions.

We are apt, I think, to confound in idea two very different faculties, hope and imagination. Naturally enough. They are close companions, and hope can live only in what it fancies. They are nevertheless separate endowments. Great account was made of the imagination in the philosophy of certain Stoics. One of them, Musonius Rufus, becomes almost unintelligible in the excess of his praise, when he says: "Of the things that exist, God has put some in our power and has withheld others. In the number of the first is a gift, the most beautiful and useful that could be bestowed upon man, — a gift which alone can render him happy. If well employed, it assures to us liberty, tranquillity, firmness, joy." Ah! an overstrained philosophy or a poetical rapture may celebrate it ever so much. All the boast fades before that splendid answer of the banished Bolingbroke to his father Gaunt, in Richard II., which thus sums up its denial: —

"O no! the apprehension of the good
Gives but the greater feeling to the worse."

Akenside wrote a poem, that used to be read many years ago, on the "Pleasures of the Imagination." It does even less to render its subject attractive, than the excellent Mr. Rogers has done for the "Pleasures of Memory." I can think of but two passages of it that left their mark upon my young mind. One of them is quite lofty, beginning, —

"Say, why was man so eminently raised
Amid the vast creation?"

The other is a fervid eulogy, that has been often repeated, of that musty conspirator, Marcus Brutus, — the most short-sighted of patriots, and the most ungrateful of men.

I come now to the Reflective Memory, — the memory in its full stature and activity, and all its offices, — conscious of itself, and questioning and sometimes wrestling with the shapes that itself creates. Here lies the great stress of the subject. Every thing that I have thought before is only the door-way to it. The whole moral nature is now concerned in what it unfolds. What we call sentiment comes in. What we feel to be conscience comes in. And a great entrance does each of

them make, with its long train of attendants. I must look at each of these in succession. In this way I may hope to inclose in outline my entire view, and define it with something like distinctness to my own mind.

And first, of the domain of Sentiment, by which word I think I mean our sensitive and thoughtful nature simply as such, and apart from all ideas of praise and blame, and the effects produced upon it, whether mournful or cheerful, by our acts of recollection not considered strictly as moral acts. Will the mournful or the cheerful be the more likely to prevail here? Not the latter, I think. We are apt to suppose that the memory of every pleasure, moral judgments being by supposition excluded, will be a pleasure itself. This is by no means so. Poor Francesca says, in Dante:—

“Nessun maggior dolore
Che ricordarsi del Tempo felice
Nella miseria.”

There is no greater sorrow
Than to remember former days of pleasure
When we 're in misery.

Every one must be struck with the pathetic justice of this complaint. But take away the word “misery,” and substitute for it merely loss or destitution, and the thought will be a just one still. Not only is it an aggravation of a grief to remember the opposite joy that once stood in the place of it, but it is a grief of itself to reflect that we possess no longer the objects of past delight. The example I have just cited may seem to be not exactly in point, because Francesca had been guilty, and the scene is laid in the realms of penal woe. But the poet does not here introduce any idea of penitence; and his expressions are equally true without it, and much more touchingly beautiful. But I reflect upon another scene in the under-world, described in holier writ, into which that idea does enter largely. It is forced painfully upon my thought, so that I must speak of it, though it does not belong to this part of my theme. Never was so terrible a rebuke couched in such gentle language as we read in that parable: “Son, *remember* that thou in thy lifetime hadst thy good things.”

I am aware that there are some circumstances and

some considerations which may qualify very materially the assertion just made. We may enjoy with great zest a remembered gratification, when it will have its season to return, or if we may hope to taste it again. But when it is for ever perished and gone! what then? We may connect some thoughts of personal achievement with it, as when Goldsmith's crippled soldier

“Shouldered his crutch, and showed how fields were won”;

or we may mix it with some other thoughts that minister to our self-love; and so it may be made to retain something of its early charm. But I believe that the general truth is what I have stated it to be. The most delicately organized minds will be the most keenly alive, I suspect, to the fact. It is true that another poet, perhaps too much despised at present, has spoken of “the memory of the joys that are past” as “pleasant and mournful to the soul.” The heart responds to that also, and owns that there is a truth in it. But it is far from being an animating truth. The mournfulness is more than the pleasantness. The Divine Framer has annexed some kind and degree of satisfaction to the exercise of all the faculties with which he has endowed us. There is a pleasure in pity, even while it is aching and striving for the object of it. Sympathy borrows its name from suffering, but carries its reward in its bosom. “The luxury of woe” is not a mere figure of rhetoric, though it is a pretty strong one. Patience and fortitude are capable of a joy peculiar to themselves, and higher than can be conceived of by the contrary dispositions that have nothing to trouble them. The smile that comes through tears is the brightest of any. But what is the bearing of all this upon my present meditation? It may easily be computed. It only shows that the exercise of the memory upon the forms of past enjoyment has a sort of plaintive music for the contemplative mind; that it is sweet, like every other kind of tranquil thought. But we can hardly put such things among the joys of life. They are too solemn for that.

Another consideration here comes up, the counterpart to the one just described. I have seen that the most careful retracing of past pleasures can give but a faint transcript of them, and excite but a faint emotion of

them, and that there is a tinge of melancholy over them all from the reflection that they will not come again. And now how is it with the memory of past sorrows? The heaviest of these cannot truly be said to be past. They are sorrows still, and will lie upon us till total forgetfulness sets the poor heart at rest. This is admirably expressed by grand Sir Walter, when he contrasts his "sweet Teviot" with "the tide of human time," —

"That, darker as it downward bears,
Is stained with past and present tears."

Grand Sir Walter! I cannot write the name that will always remain an enchanted one to me, without marvelling that the poetical fame of it is already growing low in the praises of many; being thrust aside for the gloomy tangles of Shelley, the dainty flimsinesses of Keats, the subtile word-weavings of Coleridge, the solemn prosiness of Wordsworth, the melodious quaintnesses of Tennyson, the termagancies of Alexander Smith, the bewilderments of Browning and Bailey, and the "subjective" profoundnesses of other poets of "insight."

We are told that there is a pleasure in remembering difficulties that have been surmounted; dangers that have been escaped; troubles that have been outlived; and those griefs happily over, which are of such a kind that they can really pass over.

"Et hæc olim meminisse juvabit,"

says the hero of the *Æneid*; — "Even such hardships as these there will hereafter be a delight in remembering." Certainly he was thus holding out to his companions an encouraging motive for perseverance, and a well-grounded motive too. The greater the toil, the more welcome the repose that follows it. The more arduous the conflict, the more valued the victory. The comfort of a firm foot upon the tree-bearing land is a feeling that must be bought by being tossed upon the deep. Ease is no paradise till anguish has made it so. These are familiar facts repeated till they are truisms. But nevertheless, besides that there are some perils and sufferings which can never afterwards be thought of without a shudder, I doubt whether the remembrance of any is in itself pleasant. The ugly or frightful figure

can image back nothing but itself. Its reflex charm, if it have any, must be derived from something else that is associated with it, — something that relieves, or something that flatters us. There is a pleasure in telling of the rough accidents, which we should not be much pleased to be calling up before our own minds if we could not rehearse them in the ears of others. Men are more inclined, I think, to relate the strange mishaps, things terrible and adverse, that they have been called to encounter, than to describe any remarkable successes that have attended them, or any transports that they have been inspired with. The reason is plain. They thus gain more attention from those who listen, and affect more deeply their minds. They rise into a sort of importance from what they have been through. Shakespeare's Henry V. urges his soldiers with this spur: —

“He that shall live this day, and see old age,
Will yearly on the vigil feast his friends,
And say, To-morrow is Saint Crispian:
Then will he strip his sleeve, and show his scars,
And say, These wounds I had on Crispin's day.”

I come to the conclusion, then, that reflections upon past troubles are themselves troubles, though in a diminished way, unless they are combined with other reflections, that for some reason and to some extent are favorable to our self-esteem.

And now I stand at the highest point of my subject, — the Judicial Memory; — the memory that reviews the moral qualities of our actions; the memory that accuses or commends us; the memory that must become punishment and reward. It is no longer a mere faculty or endowment. It is not so much a voluntary power within us as an established decree over us. We cannot forget. What is done must remain, not only irrevocable, but ineffaceable. This stern fact, when pondered deeply, may appear to be the most alarming necessity under which our nature lies. “Yes, but let us be thankful for it,” says a cheerful voice beside me; — a cheerful one, but it is plain to me that it is making some effort to be so; or if it is entirely natural, it is not entirely joyful; there is a sober tone in it, that seems on the point of falling into the opposite key. But let me listen to what it has further to say. “You see here a crowning distinc-

tion of the Divine image you are formed in. Be glad that none of your self-approving memories can be taken away from you. You have here a perpetual source of satisfaction, and are beyond the power of fortune. Then think what a pure and noble, as well as permanent, satisfaction it is. How it lifts the mind above evil tongues and evil accidents, not allowing you to fear what can be said or done against you! What a protection it spreads around, and what a peace it infuses within! Nothing of the world's goods can compare with its riches. The spiciest flowers are not so fragrant, and the most sumptuous dainties are not so sweet, as it is, — and this without cloying and without stop." As far be it from my thought as it has always been from my profession, to derogate from the exceeding preciousness of this main fountain of comfort for man's advancing life! But I will be careful not to preach while I am only talking to myself; especially as the theme now becomes so tempting, on the one hand, to declamation, and, on the other, to expressions of the profoundest religious awe. Let me look with a perfectly dispassionate eye upon the pleasure of remembering the things that our consciences praise us for. Doubtless there is such a pleasure; and in certain circumstances it may be worth to us more than any thing else. It refreshes the weary, and encourages the dispirited, when they muse upon the mysteries of their passing days. There is great comfort, if we are blamed, to feel that we have not deserved it, and if we meet with misfortunes, to be aware of no wrong of ours that brought them on. And if this seems too negative and too pale a joy, I must admit, further, that lively emotions of more than content may arise in the soul at the retrospect of faithful services rendered to others, or instances of a still better fidelity practised towards the obligations that belong peculiarly to our secret selves. Still, the pleasure must be allowed to be a very sober kind of pleasure. I am loath to think, also, how much of the peace of a good conscience may be resolved into the mere feeling of protection against obloquy and against fear; how much of our self-commendation may be but the echo of the praises of other people, or only the complacency of reputable circumstances; how many of the favors we have conferred were for the favor

that we could win, at least in the shape of gratitude or affection or applause; and how little the highest and most disinterested virtues we have ever displayed can confer upon our remembrance, that is not found in the present exercise of the good dispositions that prompted them. But I go further than this. I must look back with a very mixed emotion upon the best that has been in me and that has been accomplished by me. The delights that I can imagine to flow into the memory of another from this source, I but imperfectly partake of. How deficient with me has every thing been! The memory that I have done any thing well, is the memory also that I did no more. I may try to persuade myself that it was all I could, but it was not all I could. "Be merciful to me a sinner," whispers strangely out of my secret consciousness over the whole of it. I have loved my friends and partners, and endeavored to contribute something to their happiness. But they are gone, and I did not love them half enough, and the measure of my service to them was but half filled up, — scanty when it was not grudged. O that I could have them back, if it were only for an hour, that I might then show them all that the memory of them awakens in my heart! And this is but one example from a great host. There is something absolutely painful in the idea of the blemishes, the shortcomings, the alloys of what a vain spirit extols as its chief praise. O the failings of temper, and the evil thoughts though they never ripened, and the reluctances to keep in the right, and the accidents which were all that kept me in the right at last! I will bless the Providence that has spared me from doing worse; but I am afraid to bless myself for the poor performances, that were wrought but through its leading hand and must be committed with the deepest humility to its forbearing sentence. Memory does not help me here, then, to gratifications so high as it is usually represented to impart. The felicity that is to crown it, if ever, lies not behind us, but further on.

The last point in the subject at length faces me, and I must look at it. It is the memory of misdeeds; of injuries that cannot be repaired or atoned for; of sins which will appear worse at every retrospection, as we recede further from the temptations that at first hid their offence,

and from the enjoyments that at first sweetened it. If the mention of our well-deserving can bring but a troubled joy, what can the rehearsal of our ill-deservings awaken in us but an unmingled misery? I suppose that remorse, coupled, as it always must be, with the torment of fear, is the most harrowing grief of which the mind is capable. Here are displayed the features of Divine Judgment. Here is opened the gate of infernal pain. I once heard Dr. Chalmers preach, and the chief aim of his discourse was to show that the anguish of a convict soul at the recollection of its guilt transcends all those descriptions of penal fire which have been chosen to represent it. This truth has been made as impressive by the novels that every one reads, as it could be by the eloquence of the most famous divine. We all admit the warning fact. And as I meditate upon it, I say, If I could ever think of such a thing as weighing against each other the pleasures and pains of memory, this consideration alone would make the scale sink at once that was charged with such a weight of sorrows.

I have thus tried to follow out a short course of analytic thought upon a great practical subject. I know that I have but just touched some of its borders. It has more points than I have fingers, and it is too broad for my hand. I will speculate on it no further, but will gather up some conclusions from what has now passed through my mind, that I may employ them for future guidance. The moral uses of memory are all that need much concern me, or any man. To these the grand laws of our being have chief respect. In these every question of the mere enjoyments or troubles that we derive from it may well be swallowed up. I am made to look "before and after"; but to look after, only that I may look before the better. I will not be living indolently and unprofitably in the past time. Its tents have been struck, and I will resist the tendency to keep exploring backward for the trampled grass, and the dear fires now turned to ashes, which they once covered with their protection. I will not try to color up with life what has faded into dreams; and I will not suffer the shadows of what is gone to be lengthened and deepened by my unavailing regrets. Hope is better than memory, and faith is better than hope; and a faithful employment and en-

joyment of each flying day may be made as good as the whole three. No. I will not remember to repine, or even to repent. How should I be profited by either, or by one any more than the other? What is wasted cannot be replenished thus, and what has been done amiss cannot, by such a going over again, be done better. I do not really live but in what I am doing, and in what I am, at the present moment. I will go back for instruction, but not for any amusement of an idle mind or a vain or a passionate heart. I will seize and redeem from that hollow repository, where nothing speaks that has consciousness and nothing moves that has breath, the instruments that will be useful for further activity; and nothing that I can help shall be sought out from it of meaner value. If I bring forth the faded records of now many years, it shall be to write thankfulness upon all their margins, and to add other and fresh pages, that, with God's blessing, may be brighter than they.

Every one may have observed, who would, that the memory is the first of our better powers to yield to the pressure of age.* The judgment is the last to give way. The affections resist it for ever. The inference is obvious enough. We may attach too sensitive an importance to the first of these. The last is the immortal sphere in which we are lovingly to dwell; and it is this that calls for our chief concern.

I am now standing at that point of life when even the forbearance of Roman computation disallowed the title of young, and when the rigor of the very Roman discipline dismissed its soldier from the field. But I remember the instances not a few of those who, after the "four-score years" which we speak of full often enough as nothing but "labor and sorrow," rode under their helmets still; and I firmly believe that there are qualities of youth which do not care much for the calendar, but can live at the core of our being when they have shrunk from the limb and dimmed from the eye and lost color from the face of man and woman. We have our service too, though not in armor. It is not Time that dismisses us from it, and,

* In Bayle's article on *Ménage*, there are some interesting illustrations of this fact. There are also some fine Latin lines, written by that prodigy of memory, *Ménage* himself, in whom this faculty failed when he became old, but was restored to him as he grew older.

with grace to speed, we shall not be incapable of it. We talk too readily of becoming such exempts and such incompetents. We grow old in imagination too fast, — *nous autres*, — and so are less than our fathers. Whatever dreary result the Heavenly Providence may ordain, let me take care that it shall be the work of that Providence alone, and that no sick fancies or startled apprehensions of mine lay any hand there.

My subject here fairly closes, and, in fact, overstepped itself before it closed. But I will set down one word more, if it is only that I may not forget it. My thoughts have been lately turned towards an account, that might be made very interesting, and would of itself be full of encouragement, — that of the intellectual exploits of the aged. More than sixty years had turned their backs upon Bacon and Leibnitz and Locke, more than seventy upon Kant and Reid, when their most memorable writings were begun. But these were philosophers. I will remember, then, that the sun of more than three-score summers was shining on the darkened eyes of Milton when his *Samson Agonistes*, and the great sequel to the greatest sacred epic of our language and of modern times, sprung to light. St. Augustine revised for circulation the works that amaze modern scholarship with the profound intricacies of their subjects and the huge volumes of their contents, when he was seventy-three years old. Cassiodorus, a statesman before he became a monastic, was ninety-three when his favorite study of Language found him still employed with his pen. The most learned of the Romans, Varro, was an octogenarian when he wrote his treatise on Farming; and, best of all, it was dedicated to Fundania, his wife, at whose instance it was composed. The most illustrious scourger of Roman degeneracy, Juvenal, was but little short of that age, when his thirteenth and fifteenth satires showed that nothing of the former vigor or skill was lost. Strabo, the prince of Grecian geographers, was still further advanced when his folios were first taken in hand. Aristobulus, one of the generals of Alexander the Great, made it the amusement of his eighty-fourth year to write the history of his young commander. Plato was laboring cheerfully upon his books of *The Laws*, at a period of life when the ninetieth Psalm, if he could have read it in its un-

translated Hebrew, would have pointed its grim text at him, but in vain. Sophocles, the warrior dramatist, wrote his "Œdipus at Colonus" at the age of ninety; and the critics who find it somewhat tamer than his "Œdipus King," find only the natural difference between a palace and a cottage scene, and between the Theban hero himself in his martial and his secluded days. There is nothing in the piece that is unworthy of its author's fame. Isocrates, Milton's "old man eloquent," spanned almost a century, and kept his reputation to the last. At the age of eighty-two he composed the masterly oration in which he defended his profession against the aspersions of Plato.* Then there was Theophrastus, the disciple, friend, and successor of "the mighty Stagirite," to whom that most really philosophic mind of the Grecian world committed his writings. He was a scholar and a teacher, and something better than that, a man of great public and private service. Tradition assigns to him an age further advanced than can be soberly believed in; and when he left the world, it was not as if delivered from a prison, but taking a reluctant farewell of the light. He chided with Nature, Cicero tells us, that she should bestow a protracted existence upon the stag and the crow, who did not need it, and withhold it from man, who could continually bring so much to pass. He complained that, when he was but beginning to see things as they were, he should be "extinguished." Doubtless he was unreasonable in that complaint; and doubtless he was in error when he supposed that human improvement would be advanced by the further extension of the term of human life. But who can help admiring the courageous manhood that could express itself in such words as his? And who will refuse to bless that Nature with which he found fault, that she has made it possible to carry our poor faculties here on the earth so far and so well?

Examples such as have now come to my mind might be multiplied to almost any extent by those who would make this subject one of special research. I have no purpose in pursuing it even so far as this, but to record an animating lesson against the desponding thoughts

* Grote's Greece, Vol. VIII. p. 490, note.

that tempt men to give over too soon, and allow that portion of their permitted time to be darkened which most needs to be cheered, and keep them looking back and hanging back, instead of going on with their faces forward and their feet in the path, till they "rest and stand in their lot," — ay, and stand steadfastly, too, — "at the end of the days."

One who neither expects nor asks, for his part, that this end may be set a very great way off, who has no achievements in prospect to solicit the notice of men, and who is conscious that he has not the least fame of any kind either to keep or to win, sends out this private meditation to see if it can find a reader, and to try if it can be of some little benefit elsewhere than within himself.

ART. IV. — ROMANISM IN ITS WORSHIP.*

It is commonly thought that the true and specific service which the Protestant Reformation rendered to the Christian religion consists in the redemption from Papal authority, and the substitution of private judgment for ecclesiastical infallibility as a rule of faith. We fully appreciate this deliverance, which, however imperfect as yet, was happily initiated by the Saxon Reformer, and has steadily advanced since the Saxon schism.

But it seems to us that an equally important result of that schism was the revolution effected by it in Christian worship, — its abolition of the Mass and of idolism; the preponderance given to intellectual over material action in the service of the Church; the substitution of intelligent speech for manipulation and dumb show.

* 1. *The Canons and Decrees of the Sacred and Œcumenical Council of Trent, celebrated under the Sovereign Pontiffs Paul III., Julius III., and Pius IV.* Translated by the REV. J. WATERWORTH. *To which are prefixed Essays on the External and Internal History of the Council.* — Session XXII. "On the Sacrifice of the Mass." Session XXV. "Purgatory. Invocation of Saints. Images." London: C. Dolman. 1848. 8vo. pp. 326.

2. *Rome Païenne.* Par NAPOLÉON ROUSSEL. Paris. 1848. Tract. pp. 32.

Protestantism charges the Church of Rome with idolatry in its worship. This is no new charge; it was made long before Protestantism made it. It was made before the Saxon schism, and before the Greek schism, and before Rome had attained that ascendancy in the Christian world which it finally usurped. The charge was first made, not by opposing sections of Christendom, but by those who had never been enlightened by the truth in Christ, by disciples of another name. It was made by Mohammedans. So degraded had Christianity become in the seventh century, that, when Mohammed and his followers encountered it in their missionary ravages, it presented itself to their zeal as one of the idolatrous religions of the world which Islam was bound to exterminate. It would be difficult to find an instance of perversion more monstrous than this, — that a religion professing the name of Him who taught that the true worship is not in this temple or that mountain, but in spirit and in truth, should come to be looked upon with abhorrence for that very vice of false religion which its Founder aimed to abolish; that the followers of Mohammed could be shocked by the idolatry of the followers of Christ; that the religion of the Prophet of Mecca could claim, and justly claim, to be more spiritual than that of the Prophet of Nazareth.

It might seem unjust to charge the Roman Church with the blame of a practice in which Eastern Christendom was implicated as well as the West, did not Rome assume to have been from the first the *Catholic* Church, the responsible Head of the Christian world, and did we not know from history that the Roman ecclesiastics were chiefly instrumental in maintaining and enforcing the worship of images, in opposition to repeated efforts on the part of the Eastern authorities to eradicate this offence.

The practice of image-worship in the Christian Church was a gradual growth from a very natural beginning. It seems to have originated in the honors paid to those who had died martyrs to the Christian faith. Their dust was cherished with pious affection, and came in the progress of superstition to be invested with miraculous powers by the easy faith of a wonder-loving age. The bones of the martyrs were believed to cure diseases and to cast

out devils. They (the martyrs) were then invoked as intercessors who, from their sainted seats at the right hand of God, could aid the endeavors and succor the distresses of those who still struggled with their earthly load ; — a pleasing fancy and a harmless one, had it not diverted the attention of the worshipper from the One Supreme, and fixed it on limited and inferior sanctities. But such, alas! is the uniform and unavoidable consequence of homage rendered in the name of religion to finite powers. It is in vain to contend that the saint is not worshipped as God, and to make distinctions of *δουλεία* and *λατρεία* in the service of the Church. The fact is, that just in proportion as homage is paid to saints and inferior names, it is withdrawn from the only true and living God. We venture to say, that in Italy ten thousand prayers are offered to the Virgin for one that is made to God. The Council of Trent attempts to define, and says, "We adore Christ, and we *venerate*, through their images, the saints." But the prayers to the Virgin and the prayers to Christ, in Italy, begin with the same words, *Io vi adoro*.

The worship of images naturally succeeded the worship of consecrated dust and the invocation of saints, but not without a struggle on the part of many enlightened and conscientious Christians, in whose faith a strong leaven of primitive Christianity, of Jewish Christianity, still remained. The primitive Christians had derived from Judaism a rooted hostility to all sensible representations in the likeness of man, as objects of devotion or as aids to devotion. The early Fathers condemned, in the most unequivocal terms, the use of statues and pictures in that connection. Clemens Alexandrinus and Tertullian pronounced the very arts of painting and sculpture to be unlawful and bad. Lactantius ridicules the use of images by the heathen. "These foolish men," says he, "do not see that, if those images were capable of feeling and emotion, they would themselves adore the artists by whom they were executed." In spite of this authority, scarcely had a hundred years elapsed from the time when Lactantius wrote, before the Christian Church became a party to that very superstition which he and his great contemporaries had censured in the Pagan worship.

Early in the fifth century, the images of such as had been distinguished by superior sanctity were admitted into the churches and other consecrated places; at first only as local embellishments and as memorials of the sainted dead, but in process of time as objects sacred in themselves, and as mediating "the propitious presence of the saints or celestial beings whom they represented." "By a slow but inevitable progression," says the historian, "the honors of the original were transferred to the copy; the devout Christian prayed before the image of a saint, and the Pagan rites of genuflexion, of lights, and incense, stole into the Catholic Church. The scruples of reason or piety were silenced by the strong evidence of visions and miracles. Pictures which could speak and move and bleed must be endowed with divine energy, and might be considered proper objects of religious adoration."* The first significant rebuke of this practice — which, before the close of the sixth century, had become as firmly established as any part of Christian worship — came, as we have said, from the purer doctrine of an alien faith. The Mohammedans charged the Christians with idolatry, and the charge derived additional weight from the rapid success of the Mohammedan arms. The cities of Egypt and of Syria had fortified themselves with images of Christ and the saints; and, vainly trusting in their protection, had fallen before the victorious banner of the warrior prophet. Even the miraculous image which, according to tradition, Christ himself had conveyed, of his own features, to the King Abgarus, failed to preserve the city of Edessa, that enshrined it, from the irresistible force of Mussulman zeal. The tradition is this. The king of Edessa applied to Jesus for the cure of some disorder, and offered him the protection of his city against the machinations of the Jews. Our Lord, in return for so great faith, sent the royal petitioner his own likeness, which he caused to be miraculously impressed on a linen cloth, that was long preserved in the East. There is extant a fragment of a Greek prayer referring to this portrait, from which we may learn what kind of adoration was paid to such representations. "How can we with mortal eyes contemplate this image,

* Gibbon, Ch. XLIX.

whose celestial splendor the host of heaven presumes not to behold? He who dwells in heaven condescends this day to visit us by his venerable image. He who is seated on the cherubim visits us this day by a picture which the Father has delineated with his immaculate hand, which he has formed in an ineffable manner, and which we sanctify by adoring it with fear and love."

The rebuke of the infidel, although it awakened uneasiness in the minds of some, and confirmed the aversion of the few who still remained uncontaminated in the midst of a crooked and perverse generation, did not reclaim the priests who were mainly interested in upholding this idolatry. Yet, before the prevailing use had received the sanction of an ecclesiastical council, a vigorous effort was made to purify the Church of this abomination. The effort was made by the temporal power, and came from the bosom of the Eastern Church; and the resistance to it came from the Roman priesthood, from the bishops and the monks, of whom the latter especially instigated many of the laity among the Greeks themselves to rebel against an edict which threw contempt on the cherished objects of their devotion.

When Leo III., who rose from the rank of a peasant to the throne of the Cæsars, and who in his youth, among the mountains of Isauria, had imbibed from the Jews and Mohammedans an invincible repugnance to the use of images, — when this prince assumed the purple, he proscribed the pictures of Christ and the Virgin, and purged the churches of Constantinople and the neighboring provinces of their idolatry. His son Constantine, following in the same path, convoked a council of more than three hundred bishops, in which it was unanimously decreed that all visible representations of Christ, except in the Eucharist, were blasphemous or heretical, that image-worship was a corruption of Christianity and a renewal of Paganism, and that all such monuments of idolatry should be broken or erased. The edicts of these emperors provoked a formidable opposition, and occasioned frequent tumults among the lower classes, especially the women, whose superstition was shocked by what seemed to them the impiety of the iconoclasts. A ladder was raised against the portal of the palace, on the top of which some workmen were

employed in demolishing an image of Christ which surmounted the vestibule. Women seized the foot of the ladder, and shook it until the servants of the Emperor were precipitated on the pavement, and lost their lives in the fall. The murderers were put to death, but received the honors of martyrdom, which the vengeance of their party rather than their own sanctity secured to them.

The prosecution of this reform on the part of the Isaurian emperors stirred up a rebellion in the West, and finally detached the provinces of Italy from their dominion. Thus a mighty empire was shivered in pieces by a question of theology. And what is of greater importance in this connection, the disobedience to imperial authority and the obstinate idolatry of the Western Church were largely instrumental in establishing the temporal power of the Popes. On the corruption of the ancient worship was based the huge might of the Roman See.

We have referred to the history of image-worship in order to show how essential and organic an element of Romanism is its superstition; not an accident, but a principle; not a transient guise, but a vital organ of that Church. It modifies the very word of God in their acceptance. In the Douay Bible a note is appended to the second commandment, which impairs its significance, and in the manual of religious instruction used at Rome, called "*Christian Doctrine*," the commandment is altogether omitted, and the last commandment split in two to make out the ten. Let it not be supposed, that, because the idolatrous character of the Roman Church is not so glaring here with us as one whose acquaintance with Romanism had been drawn from books or reports might expect to find it, it is therefore extinct, and must be ranked with those enormities of former ages which the progress of reform has swept from the world never to return again. The ancient superstitions and the old idolatries of the Roman Church still exist in all their deformity wherever that Church possesses undivided sway and can exercise its functions without the restraint of hostile sects and without the qualifying influence of Protestant ideas and a Protestant atmosphere, which here and in Ireland and in Germany keep it in check. The traveller in the Roman States at the present

day finds the rites of religion and the forms of worship the same that they were before the Reformation. He will find the same genuflexions, the same images, the same relics. He will see, as Luther saw, pilgrims laboriously climbing on their knees the steps of the Santa Scala, and abundant kissing of wood and stone, and indulgences advertised at the corner of the streets. In the daily paper published at Rome, he may read among other items such announcements as this: "In the church of St. Marks, at twenty-one o'clock * this day, will be exhibited the wonderful relic of the most precious blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ." In one church he is offered the gratification of beholding the stone on which the angel stood when he announced to Mary the birth of Christ; in another, a piece of that on which Jesus sat when he pardoned the sins of the woman taken in adultery. If his piety craves a more remote antiquity, on the payment of a shilling he can see "the stone where the Lord wrote the Law given to Moses on Sinai," and some of the manna with which the Hebrews were fed in the wilderness. Now he is invited to adore the toe of the Magdalene, and now the swathing-clothes of the infant Jesus, or the Virgin's linen (*camisia*), or, it may be, some animal secretion of the sainted dead, for which it is presumed that the reverence of the devotee will overcome his disgust.

If his visit to the holy city chance to fall between the Nativity and Epiphany, he may see paraded in a chapel of the church of Ara Cœli a wooden doll representing the holy infant arrayed in costly garments, (how unlike those which the wife of Joseph could bestow on her first-born!) sparkling with emeralds and sapphires and diamonds; of which the foolishness marvels are related by the credulous, and to which multitudes of worshippers flock, and bow and cross themselves with the usual demonstrations of Romanist devotion. If this is not idolatry, then the word is an empty sound. It is argued by defenders of Romanism, that the worship is not paid to the image itself, but to the person or idea which the image is designed to represent. Does any one suppose

* The twenty-four hours of the day are counted continuously in Italy, instead of being divided into two periods of twelve hours.

that the idols of Paganism had any other significance than this? Does any one imagine that the statue of Jupiter by Phidias, and that of Venus by Praxiteles, were worshipped as divinities by the Greeks? No statue was ever worshipped by Greek or Roman as Africans worship their Fetich, that is, as very God. The Council of Trent decrees that "the images of the Virgin Mother of God and of the saints are to be retained in the temples, and due honor and veneration given to them; not because it may be thought that any virtue or divinity exists in them, or because faith is to be placed in images, as was formerly done by the Gentiles, who placed their hope in idols; but because the honor paid to them is referred to the prototype which they represent, so that through the images which we kiss, and before whom we uncover our heads and prostrate ourselves, we adore Christ and venerate the saints." The decree is all that concerns us. The explanation is superfluous, if supposed to be addressed to any above the capacity of Bushmen. With still broader simplicity, in the "Manual of Christian Doctrine" used to instruct the Roman youth, the Master declares that "the images of Our Lord, of Our Lady, and the saints, are not held by us as gods, and cannot (therefore) be called idols, as were those of the Gentiles, but are held as images which bring to our recollection the Lord, Our Lady, and the saints. And the honor we pay to them, we do it not because they are figures of paper or metal, or are well colored or well formed, but because they represent the Lord, Our Lady, etc. We ask not any thing of them, but before them we pray to those whom they represent." Now observe, this is precisely the answer made by the Pagans when charged with idolatry by the old Christian apologists. Athenagoras, a Christian writer of the third century, referring to heathen adoration, says: "I know that they [that is, the heathen] will readily allow that their images are but earth, wood, and stone, curiously wrought, but they will have them to be *representatives* of the gods, and thence argue that all reverence paid to them, all supplication offered before them, is ultimately referred to the gods represented, and that there is no other way by which we can approach the divine natures, forasmuch as the real sight of the gods is terrible and not to be borne."

"And to confirm this," he continues, "we are told of miracles wrought by these images." Here we have a significant hint as to the origin of the miracles ascribed to the images of saints by the Christian Church. In the manual referred to, the Disciple asks: "If the relics and images do not feel, how then do they perform so many miracles to those who commend themselves to them?" The Master replies: "God performs all miracles, but he often performs them through the intercession of the saints, and upon those who before the relics and images invoke the saints. And at times he makes use of the relics and of the images as the instruments of such miracles, to show us that devotion to the saints and to their relics and images is pleasing to him."

Such is the worship of the Roman Church at this day, wherever it has full scope and undivided sway, and is not hindered in its manifestations by opposing sects. Where this is the case, it is essentially Antichristian, it contradicts with the grossest and most palpable discrepancies the mind and the teachings of Jesus. Instead of worshipping God and him only, as Jesus taught, in spirit and in truth, independent of place, time, and thing, it dwells in what is outward and secondary, it cleaves to images and forms and implements and material objects, it turns from the One Supreme and spends its devoutness on inferior sanctities. We recall with vivid recollection our own impressions of disgust and aversion while witnessing the ceremonial of the Roman Church under auspices the most favorable, one might suppose, to its best effect, enhanced with all that religion has borrowed from wealth and power and art in the ancient capital of the Roman faith. It was in the church of St. Peter's, that "vast and wondrous dome," "to which the Ephesians' marvel was a cell"; "the most magnificent structure," says Gibbon, "ever devoted to the service of religion." It was the anniversary of the Nativity, an occasion which appeals to the sympathies of universal Christendom, and which should have suggested a simple and appropriate service in the spirit of Christ. We saw the monarch-priest, who claims to be the successor of Peter and the vicar of Christ, enter that temple, habited in gorgeous robes and borne on priestly shoulders along the vast nave, blessing with uplifted finger the multitudes

who had come to gaze on their spiritual father. The kneeling soldiery swept the pavement with their plumes, the dome resounded with the clank of their arms as he passed, all heads bowed low to receive the proffered blessing, and we thought what a scope for the Apostolic office was here! what an audience, what an occasion for a living word of exhortation, which should carry imperishable lessons to believing hearts! what a privilege to address such an audience, what a privilege to listen to such a speaker! But instead of this, what followed? Instead of the living word, and the needed exhortation, and the spiritual food which the heart craved, instead of prayer or discourse, the old mummary, robing and unrobing, and pacing back and forth, and fingering and courtesying, and lifting up the wafer which they call God. And the Protestant spectator who had not so learned Christ asked himself, Is this a religious service or a royal pageant? Is it a Christian church or a heathen temple?

We said, the traveller in Italy at the present day will witness the same superstitions which were witnessed there in the old centuries before the Reformation. We should go further, and say, he will witness the same that prevailed before the Christian era. It is a fact well known to the antiquary, and one that can be abundantly verified by citations from ancient authors, that the greater part of the Christian Roman ceremonies and superstitions are identical with the heathen Roman. The processions with lighted candles, the shorn heads, the celibate priesthood, the shrine by the way-side, the votive wreaths, the little wax figures or other donatives and memorials hung round the images of saints, the mendicant friars with their satchel slung across their shoulders, — all these and many others are older than the Christian name; they are customs of ancient Pagan Rome, perpetuated or revived. In many cases, the Christian temples are identical with the heathen. No harm in that, but the very statues now sacred to Christian devotion are statues used in the heathen worship. One is struck with the similarity between the ancient and the Christian name. The temple of the Bona Dea becomes the church of the Madonna, the Pantheon once dedicated to all the gods, is now consecrated to all the martyrs, Soracte is changed to St. Oreste, Apollo to

Apollinaris, Mars to Martina. It is true, as Cardinal Wiseman * triumphantly claims, that the *characters* to which the Christian worship is directed are very different from those of the ancient faith. The Christ is a glorious substitute for thundering Jove, the spotless Virgin for the wanton Venus, Stephen the protomartyr for the god of war. And figures with clasped hands and upturned faces, praying for their enemies in the agonies of death, have nobly replaced the haughty *Numina* of Pagan Rome. But we question if the sameness of the worship has in all cases been sufficiently compensated by the change in the object. Often it is only some doubtful Christian demigod by whom the heathen demigod has been supplanted, and the superstition which attached to the former name still clings to the ancient shrine, in spite of its new denomination. A remarkable instance of this is mentioned by Middleton in his celebrated "Letter from Rome." Near the foot of the Palatine Hill, on the very spot where Romulus, the founder of Rome, was said to have been nursed by a she-wolf, there stands, says he, "a little round temple, dedicated to him in the early times of the republic, and afterward converted into a Christian church." Romulus, on account of his reputed miraculous preservation in infancy, was supposed when he became a god to be peculiarly propitious to infants. Mothers and nurses were accustomed to bring their sickly infants to his temple to receive his blessing and be healed. "Now," says Middleton, "when this temple was converted to a church, lest any piece of superstition should be lost, or the people think themselves sufferers by the change, care was taken to find out in the place of the heathen god a Christian saint who had also been exposed in his infancy, like Romulus, and might therefore be presumed to be as fond of children as their old deity; and thus the worship paid to Romulus being now transferred to *Theodorus*, the old superstition still subsists, and the custom of presenting children at this shrine continues to this day, of which I myself have been a witness, having seen, as oft as I looked into this church, ten or a dozen women, each with a child in her lap, sitting with silent reverence before the altar of the

* Reply to Mr. Poynder.

saint, in expectation of his miraculous influence on the health of the infant."

If, in characterizing the customs of this Church, it be thought unfair to draw our examples from a foreign and distant land, and to argue from Romanism in Italy to Romanism in America, — if this plea be disallowed, we are ready to waive the inference drawn from scenes so remote, and to bring the inquiry home to practices which lie within the range of our own observation. Let the test of primitive and Apostolic Christianity be applied to the worship of the Roman Church, as practised in our own borders.

We suppose every reader of the New Testament can form some judgment of the rites and worship of the early Church. From the language of Jesus, where he touches this subject, from the spirit and bent of his doctrine, from the slight indications we find in the Acts of the Apostles respecting the Christian assemblies and the ecclesiastical observances of their time, we may gather so much at least as to judge with tolerable certainty what the primitive worship did *not* contain, if we cannot be sure, in every particular, of its positive aspect. For our own part, we believe that a correct idea may be formed of the general order of proceeding in the meetings of the first Christians, although we cannot, with the learned Mosheim,* find the programme of their service in the forty-second verse of the second chapter of the Acts.

Besides the notices furnished by the New Testament, we have the testimony of an intelligent Pagan, which goes to confirm them. Pliny, writing to the Emperor Trajan, in the second century, describes the worship of the Christians in Bithynia as consisting of two parts. They came together, he says, on a stated day, before sunrise, and joined in hymns (or prayers) to Christ, and bound themselves by oath to commit no crime, and to betray no trust. (This, we conjecture, may be interpreted as referring to the practice of reading the commandments.) Then they adjourned, and afterward met again to partake of a harmless repast. Here we suppose the reference is to the ancient love-feasts, and to the Lord's Supper, which was celebrated weekly in connection with them.

* Mosheim, Comm., Cent. I. Sect. 37.

Now let any one, who has formed to himself from these materials a conception of the primitive worship of the Christian Church, collate his idea with the worship of the Church of Rome, as practised, not in that city nor in any foreign land, but here on our own soil. He will find, we think, a discrepancy so monstrous as to make the Romanist worship seem Antichristian, if the primitive customs are any criterion or standard of Christian truth. In the ritual of the Mass, he will find a service in which no sign of primitive Christianity and Gospel truth can be traced, a service whose character cannot be explained on any other supposition than that of a Pagan original. It is impossible for us to bring together the two ideas of the Romish Mass and an Apostle or primitive disciple of Christ as the officiating priest. We have tried to imagine St. Peter conducting the service in the church which bears his name. We figure to ourselves his perplexity amid objects and uses so foreign from his associations with Christ, his inability to distinguish the *thurible* from the *pyx*, or the *alba* from the *stole*.

All the most prominent and characteristic features of the Roman ceremonial are of Pagan origin. Enter one of their churches here or elsewhere, observe the rites and functions there exhibited, attend the high Mass, or the low Mass, and what do you witness? You witness the repetition of the same Pagan rites which were practised in Rome before the coming of Christ.

The first thing which arrests your attention, when you cross the threshold, is a basin of holy water near the door, in which they who enter dip their fingers, or from which they are sprinkled by a priest. Here, at the very threshold, we come into contact with heathenism. This holy water, which is said by the Church "to give strength against temptation, to heal infirmities of body and mind, to expel bad thoughts, to banish contagion, and to scare the Devil,"—whence is it? Can we believe it to be a Christian ordinance? Do we find any mention of it in the Gospel? any vestige of it in the early Church? So far from this, Justin Martyr, in the second century, referring to its use by the heathen, says it was devised by devils in imitation of baptism, for they too would have their purifications by water. We shall search in vain for any trace of it in early Christendom, but we shall

find allusions to it in the heathen classics, and proofs of its use by the heathen precisely in the same way in which it is used by the Romanist now. A vessel containing it stood at the entrance of their temples, from which the worshipper sprinkled himself before he proceeded in his service. Indeed, the Pagan origin of this custom is so notorious, that we doubt if any competent critic, though a Romanist, would venture to deny it. Virgil in the Sixth Book of the *Æneid*, in describing a funeral ceremony, says that the priest, or he who officiated as such, went round the company three times and sprinkled them with holy water.* A Jesuit commentator remarks on this passage, "Hence was derived the custom of the Holy Church, to provide holy water at the entrance of their churches."

The next thing that attracts our notice will be the fumes of the burning incense, which fill the house. Here, again, a well-known Pagan custom, of which the curling vapor, if you are versed in the Latin classics, may suggest some apposite passage of Virgil or Ovid, or which, if you remember your Bible, may possibly remind you how old Jeremiah denounced the vengeance of God against the people of Judah in the land of Egypt, for burning incense to the Queen of Heaven; — "Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel: Ye and your wives have both spoken with your mouths, and fulfilled with your hand, saying, We will surely perform our vows that we have vowed, to burn incense to the Queen of Heaven. Therefore hear ye the word of the Lord, all Judah that dwell in the land of Egypt, Behold, I will watch over them for evil, and not for good."

Strange that so much time should be required to eradicate an error in religion! Strange how a form of superstition once expelled will return again to haunt the Church, and corrupt the ministrations of the sanctuary. Burning incense to the "Queen of Heaven" is as common now as it was in the days of Jeremiah. For the "Queen of Heaven," as all know, is one of the stated and most frequent appellations of the Mother of Jesus. Few things in the history of religion are more curious,

* "*Ter socios pura circumtulit unda,
Spargens rore levi.*" *Æneid*, VI. 229, 230.

and nothing more sad, than the change which took place in the Christian polity in relation to all these matters within two or three centuries after Christianity became the state-religion. In the time of Diocletian, a Christian could save his life, and escape the most exquisite tortures that the wit of man can devise, by throwing a few grains of frankincense into a censer. But thousands refused to purchase salvation at that price. In the time of Theodosius, one of the earliest of the Christian Emperors, so repugnant still was the practice to the Christian mind, that the very places where it was known to have been exercised were condemned as unholy. In a space more brief than that which Christianity required to achieve this victory, the use of the censer was as common in the Christian temples as it had been in the Pagan.

Now it may seem a very harmless thing, and not worth quarrelling about, to burn a little gum and to raise a little smoke in a church. And so it would be if one did not know or never stopped to consider the real purport of the act. But when we reflect seriously upon it, and ask ourselves what it really means, we shall find it to be not only foolish, but shocking and intolerable. The Romanist may plead, that in the Hebrew polity there was an altar of incense. To be sure there was; but so there were many other objectionable things in the Hebrew worship, which the Hebrew prophets revolted at and thundered against out of their purer theology three thousand years ago. Isaiah makes Jehovah say, "He that burneth incense is as if he blessed an idol." And the king of Israel says, "Let my prayer be set forth before thee as incense, and the *lifting up of my hands as the evening sacrifice.*"

We shall not pursue the parallel between the Pagan-Roman, and the Christian-Roman worship, through all the particulars in which the resemblance may be traced. We will only say, in general, that such is the similarity between them, with almost the single exception of the use of the cross, that, if an old Roman or Greek could return to the earth, he would find himself almost as much at home in a Roman-Christian church, as if it were one of his own temples preserved to this day. He would see in the new temple what he saw in the old. In the old temple, as in the new, instead of the animal sacrifice, a

round wafer was sometimes offered as a satisfaction for sin. In the old temple, as in the new, the priest began his sacrifice by robing himself with a white vestment, bearing the same form and having the same name with that which clothes his Christian successor. At his side stood a boy also habited in white, who waited upon him with the sacred utensils. Over his breast he wore a pectoral. His head was shorn. Like his successor, he made several inclinations of the head toward the altar, which was covered then as now with lighted tapers. His assistants burnt incense, and sprinkled holy water. When the sacrifice was done, the image of the deity was restored to its receptacle, and the people were dismissed with the words still used for that purpose, "*Missa est.*" We have here the original of the Mass,* as it is practised, with little variation, at the present day. It betrays at a glance its Pagan origin. There is nothing in the New Testament, nothing in the known habits of the first Christians, that even foreshadows it.

And as the worship, so many other things appertaining to this Church, were imported into it from Pagan Rome, — its ecclesiastical orders, its supreme pontiff and sacred college, its monks and friars, its penances and fasts, and pilgrimages and flagellations, its celibacy and processions, some of its doctrine, its purgatory and masses from the dead. Indeed a Catholic writer quoted by Middleton "acknowledges this conformity between the Pagan and Popish rites, and defends the admission of the ceremonies of Heathenism into the service of the Church by the authority of the wisest Popes, who found it necessary, he says, 'in the conversion of the Gentiles, to dissemble and wink at many things, and yield to the times; and not to use force against customs which the people were so obstinately fond of, nor to think of extirpating at once every thing that seemed profane, but to supersede in some measure the obligations of the sacred laws till these converts, convinced by degrees, and informed of the whole truth by the Holy Spirit, should submit in earnest to the yoke of Christ.'"

Here we have from a Romanist a frank confession of that compromise between the Christianity of the Middle

* Rome Païenne.

Ages and Paganism, which the constitution, the ritual, and the whole arrangement of the Roman Church so clearly betray,—a compromise which, in the matter of theology, is not confined to the Roman Church, but includes the greater part of Christendom without, as well as Christendom within, that domain,—a compromise which began with the modification of the Christian *doctrine* in the fourth century, and culminated with the institution of idolatry by ecclesiastical authority in the eighth and ninth centuries.

These two powers, Rome and Christianity, in the early ages of the Church stood opposed to each other, like two combatants engaged in a desperate struggle for life or death. The elder and seemingly more powerful was richly clad, and furnished with ample and splendid equipments, and had moreover the important advantage of prior possession and hereditary right to the soil. The other and younger was poor and naked, an alien and intruder. It seemed an unequal combat, like that between David and Goliath, and all who beheld it predicted a speedy and easy triumph to the giant champion who stood so broad and strong, and cursed the stripling by his gods, and devoted him to the fowls of the air and the beasts of the field. But the younger, fighting in the name of the Lord of hosts, with the lithe and flexile vigor of youth, at length prevails; he fells his mighty antagonist to the ground, and the victory seems complete. But just as he is planting his foot on the neck of the uncircumcised, his eye is caught by the costly attire and shining garniture of his adversary, and he thinks within himself how well these robes and jewels would become his own person, and what accession of dignity and increase of influence among the nations he might secure to himself by means of them. And so he strips his prostrate foe and exults in his glittering spoils. But with the habiliments and manners of the Gentile, there comes over him the spirit of the Gentile; and he compromises, and dallies with uses which were once an abomination to him, and goes gadding after strange altars, until it becomes doubtful, after all, which party has really conquered in this warfare. If the Christian name was triumphant, the Pagan spirit prevailed.

Standing in the Flavian Amphitheatre, the chief arena

of this contest, where Christians were thrown to the lions whenever the Roman populace wanted a holiday, we thought, what a triumph of the Gospel! when we saw planted in the midst of that vast circus the symbol-cross which once would have been regarded as an offence, if seen within the walls of the city. But when we drew near and read the inscription, "All who kiss this holy cross shall receive two hundred days of indulgence,"* and when, lingering near, we saw numbers of all classes press their forehead and their lips to the senseless wood for the sake of the promised grace, it seemed to us that the ground was Pagan still, and that Christianity was crucified afresh in this unchristian superstition.

There is one point connected with this subject, which involves a matter of doctrine as well as of worship, and is equally important in both aspects. We refer to the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and the consequent adoration of the Host or consecrated wafer; which together constitute, as is well known, a distinguishing, and indeed the most distinguishing, feature of this Church. The Roman-Church-doctrine of Transubstantiation, as finally established, for it was not perfected until the twelfth, or perhaps not before the thirteenth century, (in the Lateran Council, 1215,) is this: that the morsel of flour and water, which is used in the celebration of the Lord's Supper, after the words of consecration uttered over it by the priest, is changed into Jesus Christ, that is, according to the Trinitarian doctrine of that Church, into God. This is no misrepresentation or exaggeration of this tenet. The Council of Trent† expressly declares, that "after the words of consecration of the bread and wine, our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and man, is truly, really, and substantially contained under the form of those sensible objects." And in the Roman missal the functionary whose office is to convey the sacrament to the communicants is called the bearer of God, *Bajulus Dei*.

We are not aware that this doctrine is softened or modified to suit the apprehension or to spare the feelings of Romanists on this side the water. As far as we know,

* "Baciando la santa croce si acquistano ducenti giorni d'indulgenza."

† Sess. XIII. cap. 1.

it has the same face here that it has in countries where that Church is supreme. The "Ursuline Manual," a book extensively circulated in this country, among the directions given for the worthy celebration of the Eucharist, advises the worshipper, after the consecration of the elements, "Now that your Saviour himself is present on the altar, profit by so favorable opportunity for exposing all your wants and miseries to him." And the prayer which follows, supposed to be addressed to the wafer, says, "O adorable Jesus! the happy moment is fast approaching when that sacred body which was immolated on the cross will abide in my heart. My God, is it possible that thou whom the heavens cannot contain wilt confine thy greatness within the narrow limits of my heart?" The Litany of the Sacrament contains such expressions as this, "Wheat of the Elect," "Supersubstantial Bread, have mercy upon us!"

It is unnecessary to dwell upon this doctrine in the way of refutation or in the way of criticism. Its statement, perhaps, is its best refutation. An able writer on this subject, the late Dr. Elliott of Cincinnati, after quoting that passage from Isaiah, which exposes the folly of idol-worship, by describing the manufacture of the idol, — "He heweth him cedars, he burneth part thereof in the fire, with part thereof he roasteth flesh, and is satisfied, and the residue thereof he maketh a god; he falleth down unto it and worshippeth it, and prayeth unto it and saith, Deliver me, for thou art my God," — after quoting this passage at length, he presents the following parallel: "The farmer sows wheat, it grows, it ripens, is reaped and prepared for the mill, where it is ground and sifted with a sieve. With a part thereof the fowls and the cattle are fed; and another part is taken and baked in the oven, and yet it is no god; it is brought forward and laid on the altar, and yet it is no god; the priest handles it and crosses it, and yet it is no god; he pronounces over it a few words, when instantly it is the Supreme Jehovah, and he falls down before it and prays to it, saying, Thou art my God."

But does not Jesus expressly say of the bread of the Eucharist, "This is my body"? Among the thousand satisfactory answers which might be made to this argument, and to this interpretation of the words of Jesus,

let one suffice. When Jesus said this, he was speaking of the bread immediately before him. Grant that the words are applicable to the bread of the Eucharist in all time, yet the object to which they immediately related was the bread which he then handled. Now, as the body of Jesus was present all the while these words were said, in its original form, and remained unaltered during the whole of that transaction, it is self-evident that, so far as the bread then given was concerned, the words were used figuratively. And if figuratively in relation to the bread of the original Lord's Supper, why not figuratively in relation to the bread of every subsequent celebration of that rite? But we will not insult the understanding of our readers with further argument on this matter.

We have charged the Church of Rome with idolatry. We are willing to rest the charge on this single feature of its doctrine and worship. We will waive the idolatrous character of any other rite or observance proper to that Church, and pin the accusation to this one practice, to this one doctrine. We say the Church of Rome worships a morsel of bread as the Supreme God; not as the *representative* of the Supreme God, — that were comparatively a venial superstition, — that would be erring only as the Greeks and Romans erred in their worship. Not as the representative, but as the present God, do they worship that creature. And we say that this is not only idolatry, but idolatry of so rank a type, that all those practices of the ancient religions which we usually stigmatize by that term look innocent and rational beside it. It is not so much idolatry as it is Fetichism. Even the Fetich-worshipper would revolt at the thought of treating the thing which he has consecrated and made a god, as the Christian treats his. A Pagan,* discoursing of the nature of the gods, rejects as an inconceivable absurdity this Christian superstition. "Although," says he, "we call the fruits of the earth *Ceres*, and wine *Liber*, in compliance with the customary mode of speech, yet do you think that any one was ever so mad as to believe that what he eats is God?" And said the Mohammedan philosopher, Averroes: "Since the Christians adore what

* Cicero de Natura Deorum, III. 16.

they eat, it is better for us to be of the religion of the philosophers."

While thus passing judgment on the errors and vices of the Roman Church, we are by no means blind to the faults and short-comings of Protestant sects. We do not claim for our own connection an unexceptionable practice or a perfect doctrine. Our consciences must be hopelessly insensible, if we can feel that we have all that we need and do all that we ought, and have nothing and do nothing amiss. Still, with all our short-comings and oversteppings, which the Lord enable us to know and dispose us to mend, we may fairly rejoice, and are guilty of no pharisaic exultation, when we thank God that our lot has been cast in a Protestant land. There is no one circumstance in our condition which demands, we think, a livelier gratitude. We may all adopt the noble language of Milton, the mightiest champion, after Luther, of Protestant principles: "When I recall to mind at last, after so many dark ages, wherein the huge, overshadowing train of error had almost swept all the stars out of the firmament of the Church, how the bright and blissful Reformation by Divine power strook through the black and settled night of ignorance and Antichristian tyranny, methinks a sovereign and reviving joy must needs rush into the bosom of him that reads or hears, and the sweet odor of the returning Gospel imbathe his soul with the fragrancy of heaven."

Our debt to Protestant Christianity embraces all those privileges which distinguish us as a nation, and above all, that civil liberty of which we are so boastful and so careless. It was Luther who laid the corner-stone of the mighty fabric of these United States. Without the Protestant Reformation, the Constitution of these States would be as impossible, as the Christian Church would be without Christ, the corner-stone. Every conversion which takes place from the Protestant faith to that of Rome, is a blow aimed at that Constitution. Every Romanist franchise endangers it. Wherefore it becomes our policy as freemen, not less than our duty as believers, to arm ourselves with the pure Christianity of the Gospel against the inroads of that faith whose inevitable consequence is loss of civil as well as of spiritual liberty.

F. H. H.

ART. V.—M. DE SAULCY'S DISCOVERIES IN SYRIA.*

SADDENED by the decease of his wife, and anxious to perfect the education of his son, Monsieur De Saulcy, a distinguished member of the French Institute and an intelligent Roman Catholic, determined to travel where there might be perils enough to occupy his mind, and acquisitions enough to repay his toil. The neighborhood of the Dead Sea seemed more than any other region to combine the hazard and the mystery: and, making up a party of inquiring Frenchmen, one of whom has just issued a work in the spirit of a Latin monk upon "the Holy Places" of Palestine, he left Paris in the autumn of 1850, determined to shun no labor, expense, hazard, or exposure, in procuring intelligence for his scientific brethren and the Occidental world.

He possessed evident advantages for the self-imposed task. An accomplished linguist, he could communicate with the Syrian in his own tongue, and read the Holy Record—the Syrian "Guide-Book"—in its original; an ardent student of Nature, every new flower and every strange insect engaged his attention; a true Frenchman, he could make the best of all the disagreeables in his way, could rise elastically from excessive fatigue, could face unterrified the howling blasts of Lebanon, could ford a swollen winter-torrent with a boy's joy, and could fast cheerfully like a sworn friar. His mind, too, notwithstanding the depression of bereavement, was all alive with hope: he kept in a constant glow of wonder, and gave himself up with a young man's enthusiasm to investigate every monument and record, every trivial incident, of his journey. We were slow to give him credit for an independent investigation of the Hebrew Scriptures: but on all questions of locality he appears to have studied them thoroughly, and to have done his best to harmonize their varying statements; though we cannot doubt that he went into the country predisposed to the singular conclusions which have given his name

* *Narrative of a Journey round the Dead Sea and in the Bible Lands, in 1850 and 1851.* By F. DE SAULCY, Member of the French Institute. Edited by COUNT EDWARD DE WARREN. London: Richard Bentley. 1853. 2 vols. 8vo. pp. 568, 658.

some notoriety abroad, — predisposed by the Scriptures themselves, honestly, patiently, and eagerly studied in the original languages. If he was something of a coward,* seeing robbers in every hiding-place, shooting one poor bush-ranger because he did not answer a question which he might not have understood; if he lavished money like a prince, contracting a loan of solid silver even in the Eastern Desert; if, with two Arab tribes as his defenders, he suffered the same robber-settlement which Lieutenant Lynch kept in awe with a handful of Americans, to levy black mail upon him and insult him at pleasure, — we are to remember that all virtues are not comprised in the same character; and that his narrative might have been far less interesting, had his mind been less easily inflamed by sights and sounds so strange to civilized eyes and ears.

The impediments to Syrian sight-seeing the reading public understand pretty well. Journeying day after day through an actual desert, the traveller is obliged to depend upon his own resources, for drink sometimes, and for food generally: he is compelled to sleep, if sleep he can, in miserable mud-holes called "khans," where he is not always protected from the rain, and is uniformly abandoned to the most insatiable vermin. He is obliged to push on through the protracted storms, because the bridgeless streams must be crossed before they have swollen any more. He must expect to feel threatenings of fever, sun-stroke, and other disorders incident to the sultry climate of the low plains, especially infesting the sunken crater of the Dead Sea, and provoked of course by anxiety, exhaustion, unsuitable food, vexatious delays, and numberless annoyances. With *our* superior facilities of travel, with our speed, comfort, economy, and certainty of locomotion, it may be hard to believe that an old country like Palestine should possess no wheel-carriage of any kind; no road that we should name such; no suitable refuge from the long winter-rains; no Chris-

* Vol. II. p. 239. At the tomb of St. James, on the hill-side facing Jerusalem, a single Arab, armed only with a knife *which he never drew*, frightened M. De Sauley and the Abbé Michon so that one of them presented his pistol, and both considered themselves remarkably preserved. The Arab's only demand was for a little money; and the idea of his extorting it from two resolute, armed Europeans is as good as that of the Irishman, who alone "surrounded seven men." Probably the beggar was starving.

tian nourishment along a pilgrim-trodden road. But Turkish tyranny and Bedouin robbery have worked together for centuries to strip the "Land of Promise" of every thing but its hallowed memories and its countless ruins. And there is not a suffering, not a peril, encountered by M. De Saulcy's well-equipped and admirably ordered party, not a famine-stricken or storm-driven march, which the ordinary traveller must not expect, to endure as well as he can; but with results far less than those which animated our author in opening, as he thinks, a new chapter in the restoration of the buried past.

Others, we hope, will share the impatience which we felt, not to visit scenes so frequently described as to become a household word, and which more and more of our friends see every year, so much as to penetrate the treasure-house which, under the name of a "*Chargé d'une Mission Scientifique*," this French *savant* has laid open to the world.

M. De Saulcy and his five friends reached Beyroot, December 7, 1850, and, as he thought, hastened his journey to Jerusalem as much as possible, though it consumed more than twice the six days in which we made the same journey a month afterwards. Arriving there in season to witness the Christmas solemnities at Bethlehem, he does not linger to rehearse those monkish legends with which the streets of Jerusalem are filled, but hastens, compass in hand, into a "field white to the harvest," as he believes. His route to the Dead Sea was the usual one through the convent hospitality of Santa Sâba. This romantic, castellated monastery crests a mountain named after the most influential hermit Syria has probably had, whose bones rest now in the midst of the inclosure which his followers still guard with their lives and have often hallowed with their blood. Friars of the Greek Catholic Church, they are bound by peculiar vows to admit no female, keep no servant, use no animal food, within their battlemented walls; and as the world with its cares and follies, amusements and ambitions, finds no entrance, all things being in common, and all under the control of the patriarch at Jerusalem, — as their look-out is over a scene of frightful desolation, especially along the barren gorge of the Kidron, over which their cells

hang on the mountain-side, — as they have but a very few books, and those in little use, in the upper room of the watch-tower, — as no person comes within sight of their forlorn retreat, save the dreaded Arab and an occasional pilgrim to the “Lake of Lot,” — hardly the tenants of our state-prison know so melancholy a lot as has fallen upon these dried-up monastics. And, that the one worst ingredient may not be wanting, it is believed that this self-imposed doom is sometimes the penance of sin, and that actual criminals may be wearing out a weary existence in fasting, solitude, labor, and prayer. To repeat day after day the same unmusical chant in their stone chapel, to till a little garden within their ancient walls, to repair the mountain roads to and from the convent, and “entertain” an occasional traveller, seemed the whole occupation of their existence. Even the excitement of danger has deserted them since the Syrian invasion of Ibrahim Pacha; and though their hospitality is bestowed with the same jealous care as when murderous assaults were frequently made by the spiteful Arabs, and the visiter has to be reconnoitred a long time after he has made his appeal at the low iron postern, even this pulse of human feeling has ceased to beat along with that of religious zeal.

After enjoying the only comfortable night's rest to be found in the neighborhood of the Dead Sea, the party, under the protection of an Arab force, took a directly eastern course to the water's edge, then proceeded southerly for twenty days, examining thoroughly every thing in their way, then turned the lower extremity of the sea, and went northeasterly as far as Schihan (Shihon), embracing three quarters of the whole circumference of what they name the Asphaltic Lake.

The first point of interest is their careful examination of the ancient Masada, which Dr. Robinson* saw from a distance, but did not enter, and which De Saulcy did not recall at the time as the altar of self-sacrifice of nearly a thousand Jews, besieged by the Romans. His description is a specimen of the scientific manner in which he surveyed every object of interest. We abridge it of some superfluous words to bring it within our limits.

* Robinson's *Biblical Researches*, Vol. II. p. 240.

"The ascent is steep and the rocky fragments roll under our feet. After some minutes the path becomes more difficult, and goats alone might be content with it: it is one continual scaling-ladder, several hundred feet in perpendicular height. If you venture a glance to the left, a bottomless abyss threatens you with a kind of fatal fanaticism. At last we reach a platform rent by a chasm. The area soon becomes wider, and we find ourselves encircled by fragments of walls, and heaps of other ruins, unquestionable signs of ancient habitations. To our left, the crest of the precipice is protected by a wall heaped up without order, and this wall dips rapidly with the rock that bears it to the bottom of the chasm. There is no mistaking the locality; Josephus calls it Leuké. To our left begins *the snake*, the path we have just followed, leading down to the Dead Sea. Facing eastward, we have before us the perpendicular rock of Masada, two hundred feet in height, on the smoothly scarped side of which appear a few excavations resembling those of a necropolis. There could have been no access but by subterranean passages from the interior of the fortress. A ridge as narrow as the blade of a knife leads along the top of an artificial causeway of earth; this causeway, uniting Leuké to the side of the rock of Masada is all that remains of Silva's mound. The platform by which it was surmounted has crumbled down, by the action of time and the rains on the soft soil which formed the foundations. The stones have all rolled over into the precipices on either side, and there remains no passage but this dangerous ridge, which we must venture on like rope-dancers, without even the advantage of a balancing-pole. In a few seconds we have crossed the abyss, and are hanging to the side of the rock of Masada. Another desperate escalade, and we reach the remains of a flight of stairs fifty feet higher up on the side of the precipice, and on the ruins of a buttress built of fine freestone.

"At last we gain the summit; and the small remnant of a path inclosed between the precipice on one side and the ruins of a freestone wall on the other leads us to a well-preserved gate of beautiful workmanship, with an ogival arch. The invention of this form of arch is thus carried back to the epoch of Herod the Great, or, at the very latest, that of Titus and the destruction of Masada. Beyond this gate a level space appears before us, the platform of Masada. The crest we have attained is furnished with buildings resting against the surrounding wall. These are mostly square cells in tolerable preservation, with many small apertures like the holes in a pigeon-house. Within a hundred yards is a ruin resembling a church, with a circular apsis. The whole is of elaborately worked freestone; the supporting walls are covered with a very hard plaster inlaid with

mosaic-work of a novel description. Moving in a northerly direction we find a large, rectangular cistern, containing of course no water. Further on is a quadrangular inclosure, much more ancient than the other buildings. A wide, deep ditch, dividing it from the remainder of the platform, begins from the left flank of a square, ruined tower, which commands the entire ground. We ascend this tower, and obtain a full view of the oldest portion of the fortress, — marked in the direction from south to north by continuous lines and heaps of large black, irregular stones, the remains of buildings that have crumbled down where they were erected. I have no doubt that this inclosure constituted the original Masada, built by Jonathan. All the remainder was the work of Herod the Great. A circle of ruined walls entirely surrounds the crest of the platform, which contains no other structures beyond those we have mentioned ; — viz. towards the northern point, the palace and a cistern ; and towards the south, another cistern and a mass of ruins, belonging perhaps to a barrack. On the southern side of the rock are a well and a vault lined throughout with a hard, smooth cement. In this we easily recognize one of those subterranean magazines in which provisions could be preserved in Masada for centuries without spoiling. Two days actively employed would scarcely have acquainted us thoroughly with Masada," — Vol. I. pp. 226 – 233.

De Saulcy's view of the sea itself only confirms that of every trustworthy traveller. He was upon its borders at a very propitious period ; the air was less heated, the vapor less sulphureous, than in summer. Death did not reign so absolutely, though nothing of life could be found within the leaden waves. Insects were picked from under the beach stones, birds sometimes rested awhile upon the water, a few bushes thrived among the crevices of the rocks ; still, he describes in very sombre terms the composition of the molten mass.

" I scarcely believe the world produces any water more abominably offensive, though clear and limpid in appearance. At first it seems to have the taste of ordinary salt water ; but in less than a second it acts with such nauseous effect on the lips, the tongue, and the palate, that your stomach instantly rejects it with insufferable disgust. It seems to be a composition of salt, coloquintida, and oil ; but with this additional property of inflicting an acute sensation of burning. In vain you clear your mouth of this horrible liquid : it acts so violently on the mucous system that the taste remains for many minutes, causing at the same time a powerful contraction of the throat." — Vol. I. p. 249.

At the southwestern extremity of the "Asphaltic Lake" is what has always borne the name of "Djebel-Esdoum," the Mountain of Sodom, a compact mass of rock-salt, never rising above a hundred yards, of grayish color, in its upper layers tinged with green and red. Here Lieutenant Lynch saw a salt pillar, which he conjectured might memorialize Lot's wife, or some similar calamity. Our French traveller replies, that in the rainy season the American officer might have seen many more wives near this forlorn mourner; as the crumbling of the soil and the winter torrents create numerous pyramids and stalactites of salt. De Saulcy's conjecture as to the fate of this ancient lady is one of the most probable that has yet been made.

"Having loitered behind through fright or curiosity, she was most likely crushed by one of those descending fragments, detached by the volcanic heaving of the mountain; and when Lot turned round to look at the place where she had stopped, he saw nothing but the salt rock which covered her body." — Vol. I. p. 270.

In regard to his great claim of discovering Sodom, it is but just to hear what he has to offer in contradiction of the established opinion, though his twelve diffuse pages must be condensed within a reasonable compass.

"Josephus mentions that the lake extends as far as Zoara in Arabia, and that in its vicinity is the land of Sodom. We must thus conclude, since Zoar was at the southern extremity, Sodom was likewise there. All scholars agree in opinion, that Sodom was on the western shore of the lake. [?] Genesis expressly tells us that Lot 'departed from Sodom when the morning arose, and entered Zoar when the sun was risen'; then the distance from Sodom to Zoar could not exceed a league at the utmost. Any locality on the eastern shore is therefore excluded. Now, if on the very spot where Sodom ought to exist, we find a huge mountain of mineral salt, called Djebel-Esdoum, bearing on its northern declivities the extensive ruins of a town, — ruins among which you can distinguish many foundations of walls, — ruins which the inhabitants of the country are in the habit of calling Kharbet-Esdoum, Ruins of Sodom, and of applying to them the traditions concerning Sodom, — if, besides, within a mile and a half we fall in with other ruins called Zouera-et-Tahlah, Lower Zoar, — is it possible to question both these identities?"

After proceeding to show that neither Testament asserts the submerging of these towns under the sea, he offers confirmations of his opinion from Josephus, Strabo, Tacitus, and Masoudy, an Arabian writer; upon which he concludes, that we may now consider an important point as perfectly established, namely, that the towns of the Pentapolis were not submerged after their destruction by fire. They therefore could never have been built on the ground which has been hitherto supposed to have been suddenly inundated by the waves of the lake.

“The logical conclusion from what I have stated is this. As it is unquestionable, that, with the exception of Engedi, Masada, Thamara, and Zoar, there has not been since the catastrophe of the Pentapolis any town built on the western shores of the Dead Sea, it necessarily follows that we cannot help recognizing Sodom in the Kharbet-Esdoum of the Arabs, at the foot of the salt-mountain which Galen expressly names Sodoma.

“To contest this discovery, there is but one course, to deny the existence of these ruins, which my companion and myself have twice visited and examined with the greatest care.”—Vol. I. pp. 460 – 472.

Now, it is only fair to admit that this adventurous Frenchman has been rewarded by the discovery of an unknown mass of ruins, such as abound in Syria, the seat of some forgotten city, passed by unconsciously of other travellers, even the learned Dr. Robinson and the intrepid American explorers. But was this the principal city of the Pentapolis? Are there any sufficient evidences, further than the correspondence of name, that the head-quarters of ancient iniquity are at last ascertained?

When we first heard this report, we wished it might prove true. The palace of Tiglath-Pileser is brought to light, the long-lost Serapion is disinterred, temples of an unknown age are discovered on our own continent; is it not time, we thought, for God “to bring to light the hidden things of darkness”? Unhappily, there is only the similarity of Esdoum with Sodom, and that is offset entirely by contradictory probabilities. Engedi, to be sure, is sufficiently indicated by Ain-Jedy, Emmaus by Amwas, Bethlehem by Beit-Lahm, Beersheba by Beeret-Seba, Hermon by Haramon, Heshbon by Heshban, Hebron by

Hebrum, Siloam by Selwan, Kidron, Endor, and Nain by modern names precisely similar, — but in all these cases, other localities help to define their position; they stand at the right distance from undisputed points; their bearings by the compass, their relations to the neighborhood, are all as they should be.

Now the trouble is, we are greatly in the dark as to the surroundings of Sodom, and are likely to remain so. No human hand is able to remove the funereal pall which God has spread over the guilty cities of the plain; nor, for solemnity of impression, should we wish it ever removed. It would impair somewhat the awe with which one visits this blasted neighborhood, could he be permitted to turn over the marble cornices and brazen mouldings, and say, "These were Sodom."

As *we* read the narrative of this appalling judgment, it fell upon "the cities of the plain," upon neighboring towns situated in the fat and well-watered plain of the Jordan. The impression given by the narrative in Genesis, the most reliable guide, opposes M. De Saulcy's selection of a narrow strip of sea-shore, and compels us to look rather for some wide pasture-land, where the numerous cattle constituting the wealth of Lot could find the same abundant nourishment as in Egypt. (Gen. xiii. 10.) If we suppose the sea not to have been salt until some convulsion of nature, of which so many traces still remain, had spread the "slime-pits of Sid-dim" over the southern banks of the river, still, a ledge at the foot of high mountains could never have furnished room for thousands of cattle, besides the space required by a populous city. If, however, pressed by this difficulty, M. De Saulcy places the town nearer that ancient channel of the Jordan, discovered under the sea by the soundings of the American Expedition, he of course abandons his boasted discovery, and adopts the traditional, almost universal belief.

A second argument is based upon the position assigned in his own map to the sister city, Gomorrah, and another prominent town in the group, Zeboim. Gomorrah M. De Saulcy imagines he has found at some nameless and inconsiderable ruins a little south of Jericho, and near the northwestern corner of the sea. Its neighbor, Zeboim, he places where Zoar stands on Dr. Robinson's

chart, on the opposite side of the sea, and near its southern extremity, at the distance of several days' journey from Sodom. Zoar, again, M. De Sauley is led by similarity of name to place just north of Sodom, at a spot named by the Arabs Zouera-et-Tahlah: to this he is guided by the similarity of name, though the fact of two places in Syria bearing the same ancient name, as is true of Cana, Emmaus, &c., shows how little reliance can be had on this alone. Admah, the fifth town of the Sodom cluster, he places west, a little north, the farther side of some high chalk-hills, not near enough, however, to either of the others to form part of their neighborhood. The moment these distances are noted upon M. De Sauley's map, Gomorrah so far to the north, Sodom to the south, Zeboim to the east, and Admah to the west, that a week would be consumed in visiting them in succession, the impossibility of his hypothesis can hardly fail to be felt. The five towns of the Pentapolis, like the ten composing the Dekapolis, must have been in one neighborhood, on one side of the Jordan, bearing one relation to the Moab mountains, which cannot have changed, however the river may have altered its course. In every study of the New or Old Testament geography, towns that are familiarly classed together are found to be closely grouped, so as to be almost suburbs of one another: so was it with the border towns of the Lake of Galilee.

A third fact, decisive of the question as to the distance of these destroyed cities from one another, is, that their judgment came by one and the same local convulsion, rendered probable by the volcanic character of the soil and the sulphureous exhalations of the vicinity, and confirmed by Lieutenant Lynch's discovery, that one moiety of the sea was sunken by some such disturbance of nature a thousand feet below the other part. Here, on these buried banks of the Jordan, in the neighborhood of what De Sauley is certain was Zeboim, and Robinson is equally certain was Zoar, on the eastern side of what was probably the re-issue of the river from a smaller lake than at present, uniform tradition has located "the five cities of the plain"; nor do we believe that future investigation will fix upon any more probable spot.

As to the discovery of Gomorrah at a point named by the natives Kharbet-Goumran, with nothing but its cor-

respondence of title, and no trace of any corroborative evidence, M. De Saulcy declares (Vol. II. p. 66): "My own conviction, without the slightest hesitation, is, that these ruins, extending over a space of six thousand yards, are in reality the ruins of the Scripture Gomorrah. If this point be disputed, I beg my gainsayers to tell me what city, unless it be one contemporary with Gomorrah, can have existed on the shores of the Dead Sea at a more recent period, without its being possible to find the slightest notice of it either in the sacred or profane writings." But in the fourteenth chapter of Genesis the vicinity of Sodom to Gomorrah is shown by their both suffering spoliation at the same time, by the same hand; and in the nineteenth chapter, Abraham, witnessing the destruction of one city, sees the other perish at the same moment, according to M. De Saulcy at a distance of seventy miles, and by the same eruption or discharge!

Had not this highly intelligent French gentleman underrated the discoveries of our own countrymen, in a field where they have distinguished themselves by an energy and good sense, a perseverance and fortitude, suitably rewarded by remarkable success, his principal error would have been spared, nor would he have failed to see that the valley running south from the Dead Sea, where Lieutenant Lynch longed to pursue his examination, was the spot in which new and valuable intelligence was to be sought, — at any rate, was an unexplored territory, the possible path of the Jordan through which ought to have been scientifically determined long ago.

M. De Saulcy's studies around Jerusalem are interesting and valuable. He was neither disposed to reject all local legends, like Dr. Robinson, nor to rely upon them as requiring no corroboration, like most Roman Catholic travellers. In this spirit he has restored its old designation to the "Tomb of the Kings," the finest ancient sepulchre outside of the city, a sarcophagus-lid from which he has deposited in the Louvre as "the covering of David's tomb"; nor has he displaced any of the principal names belonging to the neighborhood, not even "Absalom's Pillar." He is quite positive regarding the remains of the original inclosure of the Temple.

"I was aware long since that there exists, in the interior of Jerusalem, a portion of the wall which the Jews have in all time

considered a fragment of the original building. On arriving in front of this venerable relic I was struck with admiration: up to a height of more than twelve yards from the ground, the original building has remained entire; regular courses of fine stones, perfectly squared, but with an even border, standing out as a kind of framework, inclosing the joints, rise over each other to within two or three yards of the top of the wall. A moment's examination is enough to ascertain without any doubt that the Jewish tradition is positively correct: a wall like this has never been constructed by Greeks or Romans; we have evidently a sample of original Hebraic architecture. The portion left to the Jews as a place of prayer-offering is nearly thirty yards." — Vol. II. p. 98.

All this is highly probable. It is the universal feeling at Jerusalem, that the lower part of the outer wall is composed of the identical stones laid by Solomon. Monks and Moslems, Franks and Arabs, pilgrims and consuls, unite in an opinion which two facts go a great way to establish. First, no party that have held Jerusalem since that capture by Titus which seems only to have destroyed the Temple buildings, have had any interest in removing these outworks, which served to minister in turn to Roman, Christian, and Mohammedan devotion. And, second, none but the Romans had energy enough to tear up such a massive substructure,—the Turks never putting themselves to any needless pains,—the Crusaders being too few to entertain any such conceptions of exhausting labor,—the Arabs holding the city too short a time to make much havoc. And to all these conquerors the guardian spirit of prayer appeared to hover over the consecrated mount, which the Saracen honors as the last resting-place of his Prophet's foot before he mounted to Paradise, and the Christian reveres as the future shrine of his noblest earthly offering to the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

It is almost inexplicable that Dr. Robinson's most interesting investigation of "Siloa's brook, which flowed fast by the oracles of God," should have escaped our author's attention. He thinks it "a question which will ever remain without solution" as to the connection of the Well of Job and the Pool of Siloam with the Fountain of the Virgin and that of Gihon; he even regards as an idle tale the report of a noise of "subterraneous rushing

waters heard in the dead of night near the Damascus gate." Dr. Robinson deserves credit for nothing more than his prolonged and conclusive examination of this ancient aqueduct. He himself witnessed the sudden rush of the waters, which in the stillness of night might be perceptible to the watchful ear; he himself traced their course from the Fountain of the Virgin through the underground passage into the Pool of Siloam. He has left little doubt upon the fact of its irregular swelling and sinking being caused by the flood occasionally bursting in from the subterraneous cistern of the Temple. The Well of Job, the ancient Enzogel, seemed on the spot to communicate with the Pool, though no investigation has yet been made as to its supply. Kitto well remarks, that we learn to consider these waterworks as the least doubtful vestiges of antiquity in all Palestine.

The view of Jerusalem and its environs from the lovely Mount of Olives is thus happily given: —

"From the summit, the view is surpassingly fine. To the westward you behold Jerusalem, the scene of the most marvellous event that ever took place upon earth, and the range of hills extending beyond towards the sea; to the southward, the plain leading to Bethlehem; at your feet, the valley of Hinnom, the valley of the Kidron, and the valley of Jehoshaphat; to the northward, the ridges rising successively over each other, like the steps of a ladder, in the direction of Naplouse; and lastly, behind you, the desert of Judea, the valley of the Jordan, the Dead Sea, looking like an immense caldron full of molten lead; and still farther on, the dark, rigid outline of the mountains of Moab and Ammon. This is a spectacle one might gaze on for ever with the deepest emotion, and which cannot be left without regret, often turning back to enjoy the sensation it gives birth to as long as possible."

Our traveller bursts into raptures upon the Gerizim ruins, is perfectly sure of their antiquity, and cannot even yield to Dr. Robinson, that they might have been employed by the Romans as a fortress. Unfortunately, we see at Baalbec, that, where there was a fertile valley thronged with restless inhabitants, it required a military post to keep them in check, to maintain communication with other garrisons, and to form places of refuge for provincial officers in case of insurrection. The richest portion of Palestine, as these well-watered plains have

ever been, a population sufficient to require the supervision of a strong garrison must have tilled these fields, luxuriated in these groves, rejoiced in the murmur of these waters, and feasted upon this ever-verdant landscape.

His description of the ruins we give in as few words as possible; they have been very seldom visited:—

“Let us now examine the ruins upon the summit of Mount Gerizim. To the south of the large inclosure, and seventy-five yards towards the southeast angle, is a platform of rock facing the west, surrounded by foundations of walls by which it must have been inclosed. It is easy to discern that the original form of this rock was a polygon, with three long sides perpendicular to each other, each eleven yards long, to which were joined two smaller sides of six yards each. This platform is the Samaritan altar; here the victims were sacrificed, and their blood ran into the adjoining well. From this spot commence the ruins of a very considerable city. There is one singular structure built on the rock, one hundred and fifty yards in front of the platform of sacrifices, perhaps a chapel of Christian worship, its walls, four feet thick, forming a square of thirty-six feet on each side. The plan of the principal figure is a quadrilateral inclosure, having square projections at each angle, probably towers. All the principal walls are four feet thick. In the interior, resting upon the walls, are many chambers erected at different periods. In the centre of the inclosed platform stood an edifice, the inside of which was octagonal, and its entrance corresponded exactly with the principal gate of the inclosure. On the sides adjacent to the entrance were buildings resembling chapels, the doors of which opened into the interior. The guide called it the *Keblah*, the praying-place of the Samaritans.

“There is a second exterior inclosure, and between these inner and outer walls a Moslem cemetery; and to the north of this, a magnificent pool now dry, thirty-five yards long by more than eighteen wide. In its northern wall is a niche admirably carved, denoting superior skill in the art.”—Vol. II. pp. 364–370.

In the remainder of Syria, through which he took the usual route from Jerusalem to Tiberias, Safet, Damascus, and Baalbec, to Beyroot, this very independent exploration adds little to what we possessed before.

Kafr-Kenna, which lies directly upon the usual track from Nazareth to Tiberias, De Saulcy believes to be the Cana of the marriage miracle, in opposition to Dr.

Robinson, — in opposition to the hint given by the name of some ruins to the northwest, Kana-el-Jelil," — in opposition to a guide which he himself has been so eager to follow in other cases, and, as we have shown, not without reason. As the true site lies away from the customary travel, we fear it will be a hopeless task to prevent the substitution of a recent pretender, in place of the original owner of a tenderly hallowed name. But it is a pity that the fragments of waterpots seen at Kafr-Kenna by Clarke should have been replaced by a whole new one, and this again by two, which we are devoutly thankful the bad character of the people induced some American travellers to pass without the compliment of a visit.

His description of Tiberias is one of the best things in a sufficiently prosy narrative.

"We are outside the walls of Tabarieh. There is not a cloud in the sky, every corner of the ground is decked with a lovely garment of plants and flowers; everywhere on the waters that reflect the azure sky are thousands of fowl, flying, sporting, and diving. Before us lie the ruins of the Tiberias of Herod, levelled with the ground; over which the plough passes with each succeeding year, displacing the innumerable shafts of columns that still rise above the fields. In the far horizon lies the green valley of the Jordan; and on the opposite side of the lake are the rich and beautiful mountains of Haouran. In whatever direction you turn, you look on the soil marked by the footsteps of our Saviour and his disciples, and the waters upon which they sailed, all shining with the most translucent atmosphere. You may traverse the world without finding a panorama to compete with this." — Vol. II. p. 436.

Capernaum M. De Saulcy thinks that he found at the Ayn-el-Medaourah, or Round Fountain, directly on the border of the Galilee Lake, where Dr. Robinson satisfied himself no considerable place could have been, by that infallible test, the absence of ruins. There are also two other witnesses, which testify that the site of this eagerly sought city is not to be found in our time. First, that Capernaum was, as De Saulcy admits, on the direct easterly road from Nazareth to Tiberias; and not only is that well-known track destitute of suitable remains, of mounds of rubbish even, as well as more stately ruins, but every spot hitherto selected has

been considerably to the north of the customary road. And, second, the different points indicated by Eusebius and St. Jerome, as well as recent travellers, lie upon the low shore of the lake, and not upon the range of noble hills to the west, where we know the city "set upon a hill" must have been. It is possible, as in the case of Tyre and Jericho, that a second city may have inherited the name of the first, upon a changed position, and with less permanency and grandeur in its modernized buildings. And this would account for the confusion which is now irremediable. The more practised guides, accustomed to furnish the traveller every thing for which he asks, imagining they are doing a service by providing another altar for the offering of pious enthusiasm, will continue to find a local habitation for this wandering ghost of a town; but the natives know not the name, as we ascertained upon the spot; and the conclusion of Dr. Robinson is irresistible, that no one place can be found answering all the requisitions of the sacred history. A fountain, called Ain-el-Tin, is the least suspicious candidate, and there are certainly ruins of some important towns at this nameless and lovely point.

While we differ with M. De Saulcy in many of his views, we would not withhold the credit of having completed three months of exposure, fatigue, hardship, and peril, with no injury to himself or his party, with a thorough study of the botany and entomology of the land of promise, and with an untiring effort to increase our imperfect knowledge of Bible lands. If he has not brought to light much that is valuable, it is because it did not lie within his reach along the path which he chose. There are points, requiring further elucidation, which fell not within his enthusiastic grasp. Something might be discovered by extensive excavations in and around Damascus, among those vast mounds which denote buried remains of antiquity. The valley south of the Dead Sea might be explored by a suitable party, without any serious peril of life or health, and it would be some satisfaction to know even that nothing is to be known there of an outlet of the Jordan, and of ancient towns and temples. But the subterranean vaults beneath the Mosque of Omar will by and by be thrown open to

Christian curiosity, and may reveal to us some further memorials of Jewish greatness or sanctity. It was a significant type of the times, that, through the influence of his friend, the Consul at Jerusalem, our French *savant* was admitted in European dress within the sacred inclosure, termed by the Turkish worshippers "Harum." One step more, and, even should Palestine still groan beneath Moslem oppression, a firman and a government officer will usher European inquirers through these deserted crypts, and either shed a flood of light upon ancient story, or prove that, as far as the Jew is concerned, its record is sealed and laid away until the secrets of all hearts shall be disclosed.

F. W. H.

ART. VI. — PROFESSOR MAURICE AND HIS HERESY.*

THE exclusion of Mr. Maurice, the author of the books mentioned at the foot of this page, from his Professorship in King's College, London, for no other reason than that of maintaining what he believes to be important religious truth, will draw to his Essays and Letters an attention which they would not have gained by their intrinsic merits, as contributions to theology. The author is known as a prominent member of what is called the Tractarian party in the Church of England. The republication in this country of his works on "The Kingdom of Christ," "The Religions of the World," and "The Prophets and Kings of the Old Testament," relieves us of what would otherwise be a difficult task, that of giving a distinct idea of his peculiar character as a thinker and writer. Those who are acquainted with the books above mentioned

* 1. *Theological Essays.* By F. D. MAURICE, Chaplain of Lincoln's Inn, and Professor of Divinity in King's College, London. Cambridge (Eng.). 1853.

2. *The Word Eternal and the Punishment of the Wicked: a Letter to the Rev. Dr. Jelf, Canon of Christ Church and Principal of King's College.* By F. D. MAURICE, Chaplain of Lincoln's Inn. From the Second London Edition. New York: C. S. Francis & Co. Boston: Crosby, Nichols, & Co. 1854.

know that he is capable of pouring forth from a rich and full mind a stream of thought on moral and religious subjects in elegant and often eloquent language. He has an imagination and a ready sympathy, which enable him, as in the work on the Prophets and Kings, to excite a fresh interest in states of society and habits of thought and action long past.

We regret to say, that in his *Theological Essays* he appears to less advantage than in his other works. He has not the philosophical or critical mind which fits him to write on theology, properly so called. Whoever shall consult these *Essays* with the purpose of obtaining exact knowledge, or clearer views of any of the difficult subjects discussed in them, will be sure to be disappointed. The author seems to look at all subjects, as from a great distance, as if he were above the necessity of coming into close contact with them. Hence his views are so obscure and vague, and his statements so general and indefinite, that we are often left in doubt what his opinions really are, or whether we agree with him or differ from him. His mere assumptions, as the bases of argument, are so frequent, his reasoning so loose and inconclusive, and his notions in regard to the interpretation of language so lax and arbitrary, that he seldom leads one to any conclusion on which he can rest with satisfaction. What shall we think of a writer, who undertakes to make it appear, by a show of argument, that the Athanasian Creed is not deficient in charity, and condemns no man for his religious opinions?

We by no means intend to say, however, that the *Essays* are worthless. They contain a current of fresh, and, as it were, extemporaneous thought, having a nearer or remoter relation to the subjects under consideration, which, coming from a very earnest and religious mind, possess a considerable degree of interest, though they seldom conduct us to any definite conclusion.

The *Essays*, as it appears, were originally sermons, which the author preached to his own congregation in the interval between Quinquagesima Sunday and Trinity Sunday. "I did not," he says, "allude to Unitarians while I was preaching. I have said scarcely any thing to them in writing, which I do not think just as applicable to the great body of my contemporaries, of all

classes and opinions." But a certain lady having in her will desired him to apply a small sum to purposes in which he knew she was interested, he understood her special meaning to be "that of laying him under obligation to write or procure to be written some book especially addressed to Unitarians."

Throwing his sermons, therefore, into the form of essays, and making some alterations and additions, he has published the present volume for the special benefit of Unitarians. Alas that in the discharge of his benevolent labor and sacred trust, designed to rescue others from heresy, he should himself have been dismissed as a heretic from his theological professorship by members of a Church which he loves with an almost blind attachment!

The work is evidently the production of a liberal mind and a kind heart. His sympathies are too wide and deep to exclude Unitarians from his respectful regards. Here we find no bigoted denunciation, no aristocratic contempt. If the author's statement of Unitarian views is not always accurate, it is never the result of wilful perversion.

The Essays are sixteen in number: — I. On Charity. II. On Sin. III. On the Evil Spirit. IV. On the Sense of Righteousness in Men, and their Discovery of a Redeemer. V. On the Son of God. VI. On the Incarnation. VII. On the Atonement. VIII. On the Resurrection of the Son of God from Death, the Grave, and Hell. IX. On Justification by Faith. X. On Regeneration. XI. On the Ascension of Christ. XII. On the Judgment Day. XIII. On Inspiration. XIV. On the Personality and Teaching of the Holy Spirit. XV. On the Unity of the Church. XVI. On the Trinity in Unity. And the Conclusion, On Eternal Life and Eternal Death.

The method pursued by Professor Maurice in the discussion of these important subjects is very different from that of most writers on Christian theology. He seldom refers to passages or texts of Scripture as direct proofs of a doctrine, and, in fact, makes little account of the common rules and principles of interpretation. Spiritual discernment is the great instrument on which he relies for ascertaining the meaning of the Scriptures. We must interpret them, he says, by the aid of the same Spirit

by which they were dictated. Now we have as high an opinion as Professor Maurice of the importance of the spiritual mind, or a mind under the inspiration of the Divine Spirit, for the attainment of religious truth. But it is impossible that the Divine Spirit should contradict the plainest laws of language, founded as they are in the common sense of mankind, or authorize us to maintain that to be the meaning of a writer, which, according to the laws of language, is not his meaning. The Divine Spirit, exciting or enlightening our reason, may teach us to pronounce the meaning of any writer to be erroneous; but it is a prostitution of reason to falsify the plain meaning of a writer, and substitute our ideas for his, in accommodation to what we may regard as the truth taught by the Spirit, or to the demands of science. It is painful to observe, that some of our scientific men have stooped to such a miserable practice for the purpose of reconciling the established conclusions of astronomy or geology with the conceptions of the ancient Jewish historians.

The principal test of truth, to which Professor Maurice seems to resort in the volume under consideration, is the adaptation of a doctrine to satisfy the wants of the human soul. His aim is to show that the doctrines of the Anglican Church, as he understands them, supply spiritual wants, for which the doctrines of other Christians, particularly the Unitarians, are not sufficient. There can be no doubt, that this consideration, applied with philosophic discrimination, candor, and comprehensiveness, with a mind capable of distinguishing the wants of human nature from the yearnings of men in a particular state of culture and religious opinion, and the essential principles of religion from opinions and forms accidentally associated with them, will lead to important results. But it is to be remembered, that religious persons, having already false or defective notions of God, or losing sight of some of the attributes which are essential to his character, frequently want what they ought not to have. The Israelites, in the time of Moses, thought their religious wants would be best supplied with a golden calf; and Aaron, if he had written on the subject, would probably have maintained that calf-worship was better suited to the wants of human nature than the higher religion of

Moses. The religion of Christ has been corrupted by the introduction of new objects of worship, the Mass, the Virgin Mary, saints, images, &c., and by numberless burdensome superstitions, through the desire of ministers of religion to accommodate it to the supposed wants of the human soul. We have thought that we have discerned recently, even in the Unitarian Church, some tendencies to a departure from the truth as it is in Jesus, arising from a desire to make religion more interesting and effective, or to supply what are considered the wants of the human soul. It is not always kept in mind, that there are wants of the reason and the understanding, as well as of the spiritual nature, the conscience, and the affections; that a religion is wanted for the intelligent and the educated, as well as for the dull and the ignorant; that human nature demands a theology as well as a religion. As a theology which does not correspond to the deepest feelings of human beings cannot be a true theology, so a theology which cannot command the respect of the highest intellectual culture of the times cannot be a permanent theology.

In reference to this argument of adaptation, we think that any earnest religious man, whether Unitarian or Trinitarian, Calvinist or Arminian, Catholic or Protestant, having the ability of Professor Maurice, might make out as good a case in favor of the doctrines and forms of the religion in which he has been educated, and with which all his religious feelings have been associated from infancy, as our author has presented in favor of those which he holds. Undoubtedly the principles essential to piety are contained in the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, as also in the Institutes of Calvin, or the Decrees of the Council of Trent. But Christ, as we think, has included the same essential principles in a much smaller number of articles, unencumbered with much that is destined to be burnt as hay, wood, and stubble.

But without any further general remarks, we will proceed to our main purpose, that of stating some of the views of Professor Maurice on a few of the various topics embraced in his Essays, making such comments on them as may occur to us.

Of the first two Essays, those on Charity and on Sin, we

have nothing to say except in commendation. His views of charity are discriminating and beautiful. His representation of the evil and guilt of sin is none too strong. If there exist any Unitarian or Churchman "to whom the only image presented of God is of one who allows men to be comfortable, who is not angry with them, who wishes all to be happy, but leaves them to make themselves and each other happy as well as they can," we are sure they may learn better things from Christ's representation of him, who first loved us, and chose us before we chose him. Or if there exist preachers or laymen, of any denomination, "who know something of transgression, almost nothing of sin, to whom the transgression is of a rule rather than a law; with whom breaches of social etiquette and propriety, at most uncomely and unkind habits, seem to compose all the evils they take account of which do not appear in the shape of crime," we are sure they can learn sounder views of the evil and the guilt of sin from Christ and from Paul.

The third Essay is on the Evil Spirit, Satan; doubts of the personal existence and agency of whom Professor Maurice regards as a great practical evil in the Unitarian Church. But these doubts are far from being peculiar to Unitarians. In fact, very little attention has been given to the subject in our denomination in this country. We doubt whether the doctrine has much practical influence in any denomination of Christians among us. As mental culture has advanced, it has been perceived that the theory of evil spirits, whose agency is the cause of wickedness in the human soul, and of the more grievous forms of disease in the body, does not accomplish the end for which it was originated, namely, that of relieving the government of God from the charge of introducing sin, misery, and death into the world. In unphilosophical ages, it was not perceived that the existence of a spirit purely malignant, capable by his power, knowledge, and ubiquity of ruling the powers of the air, and at the same time, and at all times, being present to, tempting, and enslaving the minds of the whole human race, and, by his own agency or that of his demons, afflicting them with the most terrible of their diseases, would, instead of accounting for any evil, constitute the greatest evil to be accounted for under the government of

the wise and benevolent Creator of all spirits. Nor does it avail to say, that not the wickedness, but only the power, knowledge, and ubiquity of Satan and his subject demons, are to be ascribed to the Supreme Being. For the question still recurs, If the mixed character of the human race can be reconciled with the attributes of God only by the theory of the existence of Satan and his demons, how is the unmixed, absolute malice of Satan and his subject demons to be accounted for? What superdiabolic race between the Supreme Being and Satan caused by its temptations the more guilty rebellion and the deeper fall of the diabolic race?

So far as the character of the Supreme Being is concerned, then the theory of the existence of superhuman evil spirits is an absolute nullity. Equally nugatory is it, in our opinion, in its bearing on the depravity of mankind, whatever may be the nature or degree of this depravity. Professor Maurice is of a different opinion. "What this doctrine does theologically with reference to the experience of the depravity or downward tendency in man," says he, "is this;— as it confesses an Evil Spirit, whose assaults are directed against the will in man, it forbids us ever to look upon any disease of our nature as the cause of transgression. The horrible notion, which has haunted moralists, divines, and practical men, that depravity is the law of our being, and not the perpetual tendency to struggle against the law of our being, it discards and anathematizes."

But this appears to us to be as shallow as it is unscriptural. Both consciousness and Scripture teach us that the depravity or downward tendency of which Mr. Maurice speaks, whether it be a law of our nature, or a violation of that law, whether it lie back of the will, or be an exercise of the will, is still a part of ourselves. To assert that it is the physical influence of Satan, independent of the will, holding the soul of man in slavery as his demon subjects do the body, would be to ascribe the sinfulness of man to a foreign physical source, and furnish an excuse for it. But the Scriptures uniformly represent it as the very highest degree of guilt, and the most enormous wickedness, to be under the influence of Satan. But if the influence of Satan is regarded by Professor Maurice as not physical, but only moral or

persuasive, only furnishing suggestions to sin, only a temptation from without, then the temptations of Satan are merely occasional causes of sin, and no more explain the downward tendencies in human nature, than the temptations which men and circumstances present. This seems agreeable to the Scripture representation. The temptations represented as having been placed before David, Jesus, and Judas seem to contain in them no remarkable persuasiveness. Some of them would appear to require very little self-command for their resistance. We think that any father would rather have his son subject to all the temptations which in the Scriptures are represented as suggested by Satan, than to the society of one profligate and abandoned man or woman. Eve tempted Adam, and the Serpent tempted Eve. Why was not the former temptation as great as the latter, and why would the latter be greater, if the Serpent were Satan, than if, as Josephus supposes, he were only a talking animal? Or why would not the mere beauty of the apples be as great a temptation as either? And why would the temptation to fling himself down from the battlements of the temple be greater, if presented to our Saviour by the Evil One, than if presented by a member of the Jewish Sanhedrim?

We still, therefore, are left to account for the depravity in man, whatever it be, which induces him to yield to the temptations of Satan, as much as for that which induces him to yield to the temptations of men and circumstances. In fact, the known appetites, passions, and desires which belong to human nature, in connection with the circumstances in which men are placed, account for all the sin in the world. What judge or jury at the present day attempts to explain the most enormous crimes in any other way than by reference to the character and circumstances of the offenders?

The theory, therefore, of the existence and agency of Satan and his demons is entirely superfluous. It explains nothing in heaven or on earth. It carries no terror with it. The sermon of the distinguished Unitarian, Dr. Priestley, on the danger of evil habits, is adapted to excite more alarm than any description of Satan which we have seen, not even excepting that of our favorite, John Bunyan.

Unless, therefore, there be infallible authority for it, the Jewish doctrine of evil spirits, which existed before and at the time of Christ, would seem to be highly improbable. Whether there be such infallible authority, we have not time and space at present to consider. One thing, however, we will add. The doctrine of the agency of Satan and his subject demons in causing the diseases of curvature of the spine, epilepsy, insanity, and dumbness at the present day, as well as eighteen hundred years ago, is inseparably connected with that of his influence over the soul. The facts are still the same. The diseases still exist in this country, as they did in Palestine. In some countries, as in India, the belief in diabolical agency as their cause, in remarkable harmony with the Jewish conceptions, still exists, and is, as might be expected, attended with the most appalling consequences.* We have no disposition to call in question the merely speculative proposition, that there are evil spirits in the invisible world, or the possibility that they may have some imperceptible influence on the human race. What is that to us? Our business is to attend to our inward tendencies to sin, and to the known temptations which surround us. But to accept the whole Jewish conception of Satan and his angels, with their influence on the bodies and souls of men, is quite another thing. It is not mere speculation, but something which comes home to the bosom, when fathers and mothers are obliged, if consistent in their religious faith, to regard one of their children who may be afflicted with epilepsy, or dumbness, or insanity, as possessed with a demon, or the victim and sport of Satan himself. But if you take one part of the Jewish representation of Satan and his influence on the human race on the mere ground of authority, you are bound in consistency to take the whole. In regard to this question of authority, there is one thing which we may venture to promise. When our orthodox churches and theologians will reconcile with the passages of the New Testament relating to the subject their belief of the cessation of the influence of Satan and his angels upon the bodies of men *at the present day* in causing the above-mentioned diseases, we

* See Roberts's Oriental Illustrations, on Matt. xii. 27.

will undertake to do the same thing in reference to his influence on the human soul. As to the general prevalence of the belief in evil spirits, which some regard as an argument for their existence, we account for it in the same way as for polytheism and other false opinions. There has ever been a tendency to hypostatize the causes or influences by which the good or evil of mankind is effected.

In Essays IV. and V. Professor Maurice speaks of the discovery of a Redeemer by men, by which Redeemer he understands the Divine Son of God, the second person in the Trinity. And to what part of the Scriptures will our Unitarian readers believe that Professor Maurice has taken us to establish this part of his creed? To the book of Job? But it is even so. We will give what he says, in his own language.

"His [Job's] confidence that he has a righteousness, a real substantial righteousness, which no one shall remove from him, which he will hold fast and not let go, waxes stronger as his pain becomes bitterer and more habitual. There are great alternations of feeling. The deepest acknowledgments of sin come forth from his heart. But he speaks as if his righteousness were deeper and more grounded than that. Sin cleaves very close to him; it seems as if it were part of himself, almost as if it were himself. But his righteousness belongs to him still more entirely. However strange the paradox, it is more himself than even that. He must express that conviction, he does express it, though he knows better than any one can tell him how much it is at variance with what he had been thinking and saying the moment before.

"So also of the suffering. He has wonderful intuitions, ever and anon, of the mercy and goodness of God. He believes that He is trying him, and that He will bring him forth out of the fires. And yet, why does this happen to him? What is it all for? He will not cheat God and outrage His truth, by uttering soft phrases which set at naught the conviction of his heart. There is that about him from which he feels that he ought to be delivered, an anguish of body and soul, which he cannot reconcile with the goodness he yet clings to and trusts in.

"There comes a moment in the life of Job, when these two thoughts, the thought of a righteousness within him which is mightier than the evil, the thought of some deliverance from his suffering which should be also a justification of God, are brought together in his mind. He exclaims, 'I know that my Redeemer

liveth ; in my flesh I shall see God, I shall see him for myself, and my eyes shall behold him, and not another.' He expects that this Redeemer will stand at the latter day upon the earth. But he evidently does not rest upon an expectation. It is not what this Redeemer may be or may do hereafter he chiefly thinks of. He lives. He is with him now. Therefore he calls upon his friends to say whether they do not see that he has the root of the matter in him.

"At length, we are told, God answers Job out of the whirlwind. He shows him a depth of wisdom in the flight of every bird, and in the structure of every insect, which he cannot dive into. He shows him an order which he is sure is very good, though he is lost in it. Then he says, 'I have heard of Thee by the hearing of the ear ; but now mine eye seeth Thee. Wherefore I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes.' A wonderful conclusion follows. God justifies the complaining man more than those who had pleaded so earnestly for his power and providence. They are forgiven when he prays for them. And the last days of Job are better than the beginning." — pp. 58 – 60.

All this is just, and well expressed. But where is the evidence that it was *the Son* of God in whom Job placed his hope ? Where is the evidence that Job placed his hope in any person, but the one Supreme God ? Is it in the word Redeemer ? But the word Redeemer is everywhere in the Old Testament applied to Jehovah. If in all these cases Professor Maurice maintains the second person of the Trinity to be denoted, then no first person, no Father, is mentioned in the Old Testament. Is it in the words "stand upon the earth" ? But in Psalm xii. 5 we read, "For the sighing of the needy now will I stand up, saith Jehovah," and the same phraseology occurs elsewhere not infrequently. The whole structure of the poem, in which Job is the chief character, shows that by the Redeemer, or Vindicator, elsewhere in our Common Version translated *avenger*, the author understands the Supreme Being. The same person who afflicted Job is confidently expected to deliver him from his afflictions. "Even now," he says, i. e. in the midst of his pains and calumnies, "my Witness is in heaven and my Advocate on high." What can be more consonant to human experience than that the writer should represent Job at one time in a state of extreme depression, arising from the thought of his wrongs, the severity of his afflictions, and the natural tendency of his disease,

as expressing himself in the language of despair, and yet soon after as animated by conscious integrity, and the thought of God's justice, goodness, and power, so that he breaks forth into the language of hope and confidence. Does not the same thing occur in the experience of Him whom all believe to have needed no Redeemer under God? Does not He exclaim at one moment, "Now is my soul troubled, and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour!" and in a few moments after, "Now is the Son of Man glorified!" Is not his language at one time, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" and in a short time after, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit!" There was no need here, or in the case of Job, to pass from a Father, who could or would not inspire confidence or hope, to a Son, that would. It was only necessary to turn his mind to his Father's righteousness and love. The confidence of Job was justified, when afterwards Jehovah, his Redeemer and Vindicator, stood upon the earth, as represented in chapter xxxviii. etc., and, after having reprov'd him for irreverence and presumption in argument, pronounces him righteous rather than his friends, and gives him twice as much as he had before.

One would suppose, in reading the two essays under consideration, that Professor Maurice's conception of the first person in the Trinity was the mere impersonation of absolute irresistible power, drawn chiefly from a view of the material world, and standing aloof from the souls of men. Any one entertaining such a view would undoubtedly feel the need of a second person in the Trinity to represent the mercy which man needs, and of still a third, the Comforter, who might communicate light and strength to the soul. But they who have learned from the highest instincts or intuitions of their own souls, as well as from the representations of the Old and New Testaments, to ascribe to the one supreme personal God all the perfections which Professor Maurice ascribes to three persons, find their faith adequate to all their needs. They feel not the need, to which Professor Maurice alludes, of a "daysman," i. e. an umpire, to lay his hand on the Deity and on them, in order to shield them from the Divine power in matters between Him and them, such as Job is represented as desiring in one of his most self-con-

fidant and irreverent speeches, for which he is afterwards, in a strain of sublime irony, reproved by the Deity, and for which he repents in dust and ashes. They do not undervalue the intercession of Christ; but they regard it, not as a means of shielding them from the Divine power, but of commending them to the Divine mercy.

But enough of Professor Maurice's attempt to find the second person of the Trinity in the Book of Job. We turn with pleasure to another Essay, that on the Atonement. We are not sure that we comprehend, or assent to, all the somewhat mystical speculations of Professor Maurice on the subject. But one thing he makes perfectly clear, namely, that he believes the essence of the Atonement to consist in Christ's delivering men from sin and not from punishment, and implanting in them by the grace of God a true righteousness. He rejects with horror every vestige of the received or orthodox doctrine, — the only view of the Atonement which Unitarians have cared to oppose, — the doctrine of vicarious punishment, punishment by substitute, that which represents God as inflicting upon Christ all the punishment which the wicked deserve, or one equivalent to it. Even in the diluted form in which it is presented by Archbishop Magee, Professor Maurice regards it as of most pernicious tendency. We cannot but rejoice when we see one distinguished writer after another of different religious denominations, Baptist, Congregational, and Episcopalian, such as Dr. Wayland,* Dr. Bushnell, Coleridge,† and Professor Maurice, contributing their aid toward effacing this hideous blot upon our common Christianity. We will make a considerable extract on this subject, as valuable in itself, and explaining the views of our author: —

“ I admitted that there were grave and earnest protests against much of what is called the Protestant doctrine of the Atonement. ‘ You hold,’ it is said, ‘ that God had condemned all his creatures to perish, because they had broken his law; that his justice could not be satisfied without an infinite punishment; that that infinite punishment would have visited all men, if Christ in his mercy to men had not interposed and offered himself as the substitute for them; that, by enduring an inconceivable amount of anguish, he reconciled the Father, and

* University Sermons, p. 146.

† Aids to Reflection, Aph. 19.

made it possible for him to forgive those who would believe. This whole statement,' the objector continues, 'is based on a certain notion of justice. It professes to explain, on certain principles of justice, what God ought to have done, and what he actually has done. And this notion of justice outrages the conscience to which you seem to offer your explanation. You often feel that it does. You admit that it is not the kind of justice which would be expected of men. And then you turn round and ask us what we can know of God's justice; how we can tell that it is of the same kind with ours? After arguing with us, to show the necessity of a certain course, you say that the argument is good for nothing; we are not capable of taking it in! Or else you say that the carnal mind cannot understand spiritual ideas. We can only answer, We prefer our carnal notion of justice to your spiritual one. We can forgive a fellow-creature a wrong done to us, without exacting an equivalent for it; we blame ourselves if we do not; we think we are offending against Christ's command, who said, "Be ye merciful as your Father in heaven is merciful," if we do not. We do not feel that punishment is a satisfaction to our minds; we are ashamed of ourselves when we consider it is. We may suffer a criminal to be punished, but it is that we may do him good, or assert a principle. And if that is our object, we do not suffer an innocent person to prevent the guilty from enduring the consequences of his guilt, by taking them upon himself. Are these moral maxims in our case, or are the opposing maxims moral? If they are moral, should we, because God is much more righteous than we can imagine or understand, attribute to him what we should consider a very low righteousness, or unrighteousness, in us?'

"These questions are asked on all sides of us. It is obvious that they are most deep and awful questions. They touch upon the very principles of morality and godliness. I know well how clergymen persuade themselves that it is right and safe to pass them by. They say, 'Such doubts bewilder the minds of our flocks upon a doctrine which is, of all others, the most vital. Let one of these objectors,' they say, 'go with us to the bedsides of some of the humblest, purest Christians. We will show them those who have grown up from their childhood in love and good works. We will show them penitent Magdalens. The testimony of both will be the same. "To lose this doctrine, of God having reconciled sinners to himself, would be to lose every thing. Without it we do not care for life here or hereafter. We do not know what life here or hereafter could mean." Are we to rob such souls as these of their treasure, because some captious people find the casket which contains it disagree-

able to their pride,—because they cannot bend their reasons to the cross?’

“I answer, No; you are to defend this treasure to the death. You are to let no man take it from those suffering spirits, or—if you have it—from yourselves. You are to desire that all, you among the rest, should be brought, with all your notions and theories, to the cross. But what is the treasure which you see your humble, dying saints grasping with such intense resolution? Is it not the belief which is expressed in our collect for Passion Week, that ‘God of his tender love towards mankind sent his Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, to take our flesh upon him, that all mankind should follow the example of his great humility’? Is not this love of God, this perfect obedience of Christ to his Father’s loving will, the ground of all their confidence, their hope, their humility? Has their confidence, their hope, their humility, any thing whatever to do with the theory that has fastened itself to this doctrine of Atonement, and, in many minds, has taken the place of it? Do you hear any allusion to it amidst the pauses of that sepulchral cough? Does the feverish hand clasp yours with thankful joy, when you speak of a Divine justice delighting in infinite punishment? Does the loving, peaceful eye respond to the idea that the Son of God has delivered his creatures from their Father’s determination to execute his wrath upon them?” — pp. 137 – 141.

Again, he says:—

“I must give up Archbishop Magee, for I am determined to keep that which makes the Atonement precious to my heart and conscience.” — p. 149.

In the Essay on the Judgment Day, Professor Maurice advocates the view, that no one particular time is denoted, but rather the various and constant judgments on kingdoms and individuals, which under the reign of Christ are taking place in the world. He says:—

“I am quite prepared to bear the charges, that I have now been defending an ideal, and not an actual, judgment day, and that I confound the spiritual kingdom of Christ with his reign over the earth. I can only answer, as I have answered before, that I have found the current notions of a judgment, not exactly ideal, but exceedingly fantastic, figurative, inoperative, and that I have tried to ascertain whether Scripture does not give us the hint of something more practical and more substantial. If the popular notion on this subject is thought necessary to produce terror in the minds of thieves and vagabonds, I own that I am ideal enough to think the constabulary force a more useful, effect-

ual, and also a more godly instrument. That does assert the existence of an actual present justice ; that does awaken in the consciences of evil men the sense of a law, which never loses sight of them, and may find out their darkest deeds ; that holds out to their merely animal nature, which requires such discipline, the prospect of a sure and speedy punishment. If, again, the popular notion on this subject is wanted as an influence to act habitually on the lives of ordinary worldly men, and it is alleged that I have substituted for it the notion of a mysterious judgment, of which it is impossible that such men can make any account, — then I reply, that it is precisely this kind of mysterious judgment which these men do recognize, and to which they pay habitual homage under the name of Public Opinion. But if you require this popular notion for the sake of religious men, or of those who are looking forward to some great improvement in the constitution of the world, then I say it is quite clear that such men are not in the least satisfied with it, but are inclined rudely to discard it. Such men demand for *themselves* an habitual government, inspection, judgment, reaching to the roots of their heart and will ; such men demand for the earth some complete deliverance from all that defiles it and sets it in rebellion against a true and righteous King.” — pp. 307, 308.

In the Essay on Inspiration the author's aim is to show that the same kind of inspiration is afforded to Christians at the present day, which was afforded to the Prophets and Apostles. Infallible inspiration, therefore, seems to be no part of his creed. He says : “ St. Paul's Gospel was human and universal. It explained indeed the influence of seers and prophets ; it asserted the existence of special endowments ; it put all honor upon distinct callings. But first of all, it asserted that the Spirit was necessary for all human beings, and was intended for all. And this human gift it did not degrade below the other, as being a secondary, inferior exhibition of that which the great man obtained in its highest form.”

The Essay on the Trinity in Unity has suggested to us the doubt, whether after all Professor Maurice understands by it any thing more than a revelative or nominal trinity, a revelation to the human mind of three phases of the Divine character, or three modes of operation of the one Divine mind. If he understand the Church formulas as expressing three proper persons, immanent in God, we can only wonder at the kind of reasoning which he employs in their defence. He says nothing to reconcile that

view of the Trinity, which Unitarians have opposed, with Scripture or reason, but only confirms those essential ideas of God which Unitarians accept. Unitarians have never renounced their baptism. They believe that the form of it was designed to include, and does include, the most important ideas, truths, or obligations of the Christian religion. They believe that their spiritual nature demands all that is implied in it. They believe that the essential ideas which underlie the Trinitarian formula, in the various ways in which it has been expressed, are all that have given to it its hold on the Christian Church. We believe in the Christian Trinity. It is the mere work of the human understanding which we reject, the hypostatizing of the attributes or operations of the one Eternal Mind into three distinct persons, to each of which peculiar volitions, actions, and offices are attributed. The reasoning employed by Professor Maurice, instead of reconciling us to the Athanasian formula of the Trinity, is adapted to confirm us in our opposition to it. He says : —

“I have not, then, to enter upon a new subject in this Essay. I am not speaking for the first time of the Trinity in Unity. I have been speaking of it throughout. Each consciousness that we have discovered in man, each fact of Revelation that has answered to it, has been a step in the discovery and demonstration of this truth. I should be abandoning the method to which I have endeavored strictly to adhere, if I admitted that now, at last, I have come upon a mere dogma, which had no support but tradition, or inferences from texts of Scripture ; or, on the other hand, upon a great philosophical tenet which wise men may deduce from reason or find latent in nature, but with which the poor wayfarer has nothing to do. We may owe much to tradition for giving expression to the faith in a Trinity ; texts of Scripture may confirm it ; the context of Scripture may bring it out in beautiful harmony with all the Divine discoveries to man. Philosophy may have seen indications of a Trinity in the forms and principles of the universe, in the constitution of man himself. But unless we are utterly inconsistent with all that has been said hitherto, these can be but indexes and guides to a Name which is implied in our thoughts, acts, words, in our fellowship with each other ; without which we cannot explain the utterances of the poorest peasant, or of the greatest sage ; which makes thoughts real, prayers possible ; which brings distinctness out of vagueness, unity out of division ; which shows us how in fact, and not

merely in imagination, the charity of God may find its reflex and expression in the charity of man, and the charity of man its substance as well as its fruition in the charity of God. What I have to do in this Essay, then, is certainly not to bring forth arguments against those who impugn this doctrine, but only to show how each portion of that Name into which we are baptized answers to some apprehension and anticipation of human beings; how the setting up of one part of the Name against another has been the cause of strife, unrighteousness, superstition; why, therefore, the acknowledgment of that Name in its fulness and Unity is Eternal Life." — pp. 408–410.

We should be glad to make some further comments on this subject, but we will only refer to one passage in the Essay on the Holy Spirit, because it contains a misapprehension of the views of Unitarians which is very common, namely, that which supposes them to deny the personality of the Holy Spirit. "After all," he says, "how easy it has been for the Unitarian to deny the personality of the Spirit, and even to find Scriptural excuses for his denial!" Where he found the Christian Unitarians who deny the personality of the Holy Spirit, it is difficult for us to conjecture. Certainly such a denial is not to be found in the writings of the most distinguished Unitarians. No writer has had a wider influence in relation to this subject, both in England and America, than Dr. Lardner. But Dr. Lardner may as well be accused of denying the personality of God, as of denying the personality of the Holy Spirit. "First of all," says he, "I think that, in many places, the *spirit*, or the *spirit of God*, or the *Holy Ghost*, is equivalent to God himself."* It is true, that Unitarians, *in common with all other Christians*, believe that the phrase Holy Spirit, besides denoting the personal God acting on the human soul, is also used figuratively to denote the instrumentalities by which he works, or the effects which he produces, and the gifts which he bestows. But they would as soon think of maintaining that the spirit of a man is not personal, as that the spirit of God is not personal. "The spirit of the truth, and the spirit of God by which it is produced," says the most distinguished Unitarian theologian which our country has produced, in an unpublished note on John xvi.

* First Postscript to the Letter on the Logos.

13-15, "become interchangeable terms. The former is the effect of the latter acting upon the mind. The spirit of Christianity, viewed in reference to the cause which produces it and coexists with it, is the spirit of God. It is under this double aspect that the spirit spoken of by Jesus is to be regarded throughout this discourse. This language is conformed sometimes more to one view of it, and sometimes more to the other. In the passage before us, it is to be regarded as the spirit of God directly illuminating the minds of the Apostles, and aiding them in their labors. It is further to be observed that this spirit is personified by our Lord, as the Teacher who was coming to supply his place. His language concerning it is of course conformed to this personification. It is throughout figurative, and consequently does not admit of being taken in a literal sense. The meaning of it in the passage before us may be thus explained: 'He will not speak from himself, but will speak what he hears.' Our Lord had before said of his own teaching, 'I speak not of myself.' 'The words which you hear are not mine, but the Father's who sent me.' He now describes in the same manner the Teacher who was to supply his place. The meaning of his words is, that there would be no error in the instructions and guidance of that Teacher, such as might be apprehended from a merely human teacher, speaking from himself. God, through the influences of his spirit, would himself enlighten, strengthen, and direct them."

The concluding Essay, on Eternal Life and Eternal Death, is that which has attracted most attention on account of the important consequences to the author by which it was followed; namely, his exclusion from his professorship in a College under the patronage of the Church of England. Dr. Jelf, the Principal of the College, first desired of Professor Maurice an explanation of the sentiments contained in this Essay, with which being dissatisfied, he proceeded in concurrence with and in the name of the Council of the Institution, to administer to him his sentence of dismissal. Hence naturally followed the Letter to Dr. Jelf on the word Eternal and the Punishment of the Wicked, which has been reprinted in New York. The whole amount of the charge against Professor Maurice is, that he has expressed doubts in re-

gard to the endless punishment of the wicked, and his belief of the possibility of the final salvation of all men, with hopes of its reality. It seems to us that the procedure of the authorities of King's College, in excluding him from his professorship for doubting or denying a doctrine which is contained in no one of the Thirty-nine Articles of the English Church, and which has been doubted or denied by some of its highest dignitaries and brightest ornaments, such as Archbishop Tillotson, Bishop Newton, Jeremy Taylor, William Law, Samuel Clark, John Locke, and others, was an act of gross oppression. In a church which has had an established creed for centuries, it is surely quite enough for a professor to keep himself within the trammels of it. One would suppose that an accomplished and liberal-minded man might find it a very severe strain upon his reason and conscience to do so much as that. We wish there was more ground than we fear there is, to hope that Dr. Jelf and his coadjutors might receive the rebuke which they deserve from the authorities of the English Church, as well as from public opinion.

The briefest passages in which Professor Maurice sets forth his views on this important subject are the following: —

"The word 'eternal,' if what I have said is true, is a keyword of the New Testament. To draw our minds from the temporal, to fix them on the eternal, is the very aim of the Divine economy. How much ought we, then, to dread any confusion between thoughts which our Lord has taken such pains to keep distinct, — which our consciences tell us ought to be kept distinct! How dangerous to introduce the notion of duration into a word from which he has deliberately excluded it! And yet this is precisely what we are in the habit of doing, and it is this which causes such infinite perplexity to our minds. 'Try to conceive,' the teacher says, 'a thousand years. Multiply these by a thousand, by twenty thousand, by a hundred thousand, by a million. Still you as far off from eternity as ever.' Certainly I am, quite as far. Why then did you give me that sum to work out? What could be the use of it, except to bewilder me, except to make me disbelieve in eternity altogether? Do you not see that this course must be utterly wrong and mischievous? If eternity is the great reality of all, and not a portentous fiction, how dare you impress such a notion of fictitiousness on my mind as your process of illustration conveys? 'But is it not

the only process ? ' Quite the only one, so far as I see, if you will bring time into the question ; if you will have years and centuries to prevent you from taking in the sublime truth, ' This is life eternal, to know God.' " — pp. 436, 437.

" And what are we doing with that high and holy office of judgment which we assign to Christ ? He speaks of few stripes and many stripes : he makes us feel that there will be the most accurate and just assertion of what each man is ; the most righteous vindication of every wish, and thought, and hope, that has been true, and that has therefore sprung from him ; the is found. And we, under pretence of interpreting the text, most righteous condemnation of that which is false, wherever it ' Where the tree falleth, it shall lie,' — which apparently has very little to do with the subject, but, if it has, suggests the most opposite sense to this, — affirm that the whole body of human creatures who have not yet apprehended Christ as their Justifier, and God as their Father, pass from hence into a state in which that apprehension is impossible. We, and not Christ, are judging ! And our judgment proceeds on the principle that there is no living relation between him and the creatures whose nature he took, and for whom he died.

" This cannot be Protestantism, cannot be Christianity. Let us Englishmen live and die to assert that it is not. We do not want theories of Universalism ; they are as cold, hard, unsatisfactory, as all other theories. But we want that clear, broad assertion of the Divine charity which the Bible makes, and which carries us immeasurably beyond all that we can ask or think. What dreams of ours can reach to the assertion of St. John, that death and hell themselves shall be cast into the lake of fire ? I cannot fathom the meaning of such expressions. But they are written ; I accept them, and give thanks for them. I feel there is an abyss of death, into which I may sink and be lost. Christ's Gospel reveals an abyss of love, below that ; I am content to be lost in that. I know no more, but I am sure that there is a woe on us if we do not preach this Gospel, if we do not proclaim the name of the Father, the Son, and the Spirit, — the Eternal Charity. Whenever we do proclaim that name, I believe we invade the realm of night and eternal death, and open the kingdom of heaven." — pp. 441 – 443.

From these passages it appears that there is in this Essay on this most interesting subject no confident dogmatism on the part of Professor Maurice, but only a modest expression of the same doubts and difficulties which have arisen in religious minds, not only in the Church of England, but in all denominations of Chris-

tians, and in all ages of the Church, from its very foundation. We have not time and space to go largely into the subject. We will only advert to one great fact, which ought, as it seems to us, to excite doubts in all minds in regard to the endless punishment of the wicked; namely, the fact, that so many persons leave the present world with a manifest capacity of improvement. If all who were called by their Creator from the present life were hardened offenders, on whom moral discipline would be likely to be thrown away, there would be less reason to wonder at the confidence of the advocates of endless punishment, however much their views might seem to conflict with the revealed attributes of God. Even among the most hardened and abandoned sinners, we find so many instances of reformation through means of Divine appointment, that we have no right to say that any are beyond the reach of Divine influences. There seems to be in all men a principle of reverence for duty and for God, and a capacity of being touched by benevolence and kindness, which, though often smothered by sense and passion, never become extinct. Although the case of the most hardened in sin may seem to be nearly hopeless, as long as they remain in this world, amid the temptations which have overpowered them, may there not be a hope that the inextinguishable sentiment of duty and religion may yet revive, under circumstances and influences which the Divine Mind, in the inexhaustible riches of its wisdom and mercy, may know how to employ? So much may be said for the most hardened offenders against human and Divine law. But it is well known that the majority of those who leave the world are not such as these, but rather such as are manifestly capable of reformation. Some die at the age of ten, fifteen, or twenty, who are irreligious and vicious, but yet as capable of reformation, and as likely to become religious and good men, as those whom they leave behind them in life. Is it not probable that they will have such an opportunity, as well as those whom God detains in this world? Is the mere place where they are to make an infinite difference between the youth of fifteen or twenty who has crossed the flood, and the one who is left on this side of it? Has he gone out of the Divine dominions? Has he not been merely

transferred from one province of God's empire to another? Is it not more worthy of the Governor of all worlds and all spirits, to place these young minds in a state of discipline, which shall convert them into his obedient subjects, than to throw them away by annihilation, or to condemn them to endless torment?

And what may be said of those who die in early years in Christian countries applies to the heathen, and to slaves in all countries, who, whatever may be said in apology for their moral condition, are yet full of intrinsically bad dispositions and habits. Is it not more probable that the heathen, whose very religion encourages some bad dispositions, and slaves, the condition of whose birth renders vice all but inevitable, will hereafter be placed in circumstances, and subjected to a discipline, by which they may be reclaimed, than that they should be struck out of existence, or consigned to endless despair? Might not such considerations as these have rendered the modest doubts and queries of Professor Maurice at least pardonable? But what is so hard-hearted as religious bigotry!

But while we sympathize with Professor Maurice, in view of his hard treatment, and coincide with him in his doctrinal views touching the subject under consideration, we are obliged to differ from him very widely in regard to his Scriptural argument, or rather his view of the meaning of the Greek term *αἰώνιος* and the English word *eternal*. The opinion expressed by him, that the idea of duration is to be excluded from either of these terms, strikes us as an enormous paradox, wholly in opposition to the usage of words, *usus loquendi*, both in the Greek and the English language.

We are absolutely astonished that a scholar, so distinguished in the Universities of England as to become a professor, should advance so singular an opinion. It is more especially strange, as Professor Maurice, in common with the Tractarian party, professes great deference to authority, particularly to the authority of the Church of England. But was no deference due to the authority of the universal church of scholars, lexicographers, and commentators, in regard to the meaning of a Greek term of very common occurrence in the Scriptures? Professor Maurice, in excluding the idea of duration from the

term αἰώνιος, and making it express some quality which may be experienced in this world, has set himself in contradiction to all the classical Greek dictionaries, such as those of Stephens, Scapula, Hedericus, Schneider, Passow, Liddell and Scott, and to all the lexicons of the Old and New Testaments, such as those of Schleusner, Wahl, Bretschneider, and Robinson. He has also contradicted every Biblical commentator from the time of the Church Fathers to the present day, in all countries of Christendom. Now, if the chief justice of the highest court in England should found the decision of a cause on the meaning of a word contrary to that which had been assigned to it by all lawyers and all judges, in all courts of law, in all countries of the world, and in all ages from the time of Justinian, we suppose that little respect would be paid to his decision, whatever claim he might lay to legal discernment, and however much contempt he might express for the "formal" understandings of those who differed from him. Why should we judge differently, when a new meaning is put upon a Scriptural term, or rather a common term in the Greek language?

But we are aware, that, in a case of criticism, authority is to be resorted to with great caution. There is the less need of it in this case, since the term αἰώνιος is of very common occurrence in the New Testament, and in the Septuagint version of the Old. It occurs more than a hundred times in the latter, and more than seventy times in the former, so that there is ample opportunity for applying the most important considerations which the art of interpretation suggests for discovering the meaning of a word, such as the usage of language, the connection of the discourse, the different subjects to which it is applied, and parallel expressions and passages. We are sure that no scholar can spend half an hour in applying these considerations to the subject under consideration, with the help of Trommius's Concordance on the Old, and Schmidt's or Bruder's on the New Testament, without being convinced that the opinion which excludes the idea of duration from the term αἰώνιος is altogether baseless. But as all our readers do not read Greek, and some who read it do not own these concordances, we will refer to a few passages of the Septuagint. Gen. ix. 12, εἰς γενεὰς αἰώνιους, for *perpetual* generations. Throughout the Pentateuch the term is frequent-

ly applied to a law, or statute, or covenant, and is translated *perpetual*. Numb. xxv. 13, *an everlasting* priesthood. Job xxii. 15, *the old way*, τρίβον αἰώνιον; xl. 23 (Com. Ver. xli. 4), a servant *for ever*, δοῦλον αἰώνιον. Our former excellent contributor, Mr. Goodwin, would hardly call the leviathan a *spiritual* servant. Ps. xxiii. 7, 9 (xxiv.), *everlasting doors*, πύλαι αἰώνιαι; lxxv. 5 (lxxvi. 4), ἀπὸ ὀρέων αἰωνίων, from the *everlasting* mountains; lxxvi. 6 (lxxvii. 5), the years of *old*, ἔτη αἰώνια; lxxvii. 66 (lxxviii.), a *perpetual* reproach. Proverbs xxii. 28, *the ancient* landmarks, ὄρια αἰώνια. Isaiah xxiv. 5, broken the *everlasting* covenant; xxxv. 10, come to Zion with songs and *everlasting* joy upon their heads; liv. 8, I hid my face for a moment, but with *everlasting* kindness will I have mercy on thee; lv. 13, an *everlasting* sign, σημεῖον αἰώνιον; lvi. 5, an *everlasting* name, which shall not be cut off; lviii. 12, *the old* waste places, αἱ ἔρημοι αἰώνιοι; lx. 20, the Lord shall be thine *everlasting* light, and the days of thy mourning shall be ended; lx. 15, an *eternal* excellency, the joy of many generations; lxiii. 11, the days of *old*, ἡμερῶν αἰωνίων. Jeremiah v. 22, a *perpetual* decree; vi. 16, *the old* paths. xviii. 15, *the ancient* paths; xviii. 17, a *perpetual* hissing; xxiv. 40, an *everlasting* reproach; xxv. 12, *perpetual* desolations; xxxi. 3, with an *everlasting* love; xli. 39, a *perpetual* sleep, and not wake. Ezekiel xxxv. 5, a *perpetual* hatred. Daniel xii. 2, some to *everlasting* life, and some to shame and *everlasting* contempt. Habakkuk iii. 5, the *everlasting* hills, his *everlasting* paths, ἐτάκησαν βουνοὶ αἰώνιοι, πορείας αἰώνιας αὐτοῦ. Daniel iv. 3 (iii. 34), His kingdom is an *everlasting* kingdom, and his dominion is from generation to generation. Isaiah liv. 4, Thou shalt forget thy *ancient* shame. Job xxi. 11, πρόβατα αἰώνια, *old*, perhaps *long-dead* sheep. Isaiah lviii. 12, Thy foundations shall be *everlasting* through generations of generations. So much for the use of the word αἰώνιος in the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, from which the New Testament use of words must have been in great measure borrowed.

In the New Testament, its most frequent application is to the blessed life which is revealed and promised by Christ to his followers, and is indiscriminately translated *everlasting*, or *eternal*, life. It is so used in fifty-one passages. In seven other passages it is applied to the state of the wicked in the future world, or to the perpet-

ual destruction of impious cities in this world. Thus, Matthew xviii. 8, It is better for thee to enter into life halt or maimed, rather than, having two hands or two feet, to be cast into *everlasting* fire. Matthew xxv. 41, Depart from me, ye cursed, into *everlasting* fire; 46, These shall go away into *everlasting* punishment, but the righteous into *everlasting* life. Mark iii. 29, hath never forgiveness, but shall be in danger of *eternal* damnation. 2 Thessalonians i. 9, Who shall be punished with *everlasting* destruction, &c. Hebrews vi. 2, resurrection of the dead, and *eternal* judgment, κρίματος αἰωνίου. 2 Thessalonians i. 9, who shall be punished with *everlasting* destruction, &c. Jude 7, Sodom and Gomorrah are set forth for an example, — suffering the vengeance of *eternal* fire. Sodom and Gomorrah certainly did not suffer the vengeance of *spiritual* fire. Other applications of the term αἰώνιος are in Luke xvi. 9, *everlasting* habitations, in contradistinction from the perishable houses of men. Romans xvi. 25, χρόνους αἰωνίους, literally, in the *most ancient* or *everlasting* times; in the Common Version, *since the world began*; 26. *the everlasting* God. 2 Corinthians iv. 17, Our light affliction, which is but *for a moment*, worketh out for us a far more exceeding, even an *eternal* weight of glory; 18, The things which are seen are *temporal*, πρόσκαιρα, *enduring for a time*; but the things which are not seen are *eternal*. 2 Corinthians v. 1, If our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, *eternal* in the heavens. 2 Thessalonians ii. 16, *everlasting* consolation. 1 Timothy vi. 16, to whom be honor and power *everlasting*. 2 Timothy i. 9, πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων, literally, before the *most ancient* or *everlasting* times; in the Common Version, *before the world began*. Titus i. 2, which God *promised* πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων, literally, before the *times of old*, or the *everlasting* times, that is, the times of the prophets. 2 Timothy ii. 10, that they may obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus with *eternal* glory. Philemon 15, He departed for a season, that thou shouldst receive him *for ever*, ἵνα αἰώνιον αὐτὸν ἀπέχης. Hebrews x. 9, the author of *eternal* salvation; ix. 12, He entered *once for all* into the holy place, having obtained *eternal* redemption for us; 14, through the *eternal* spirit; xiii. 20, the blood of the *everlasting* covenant.

1 Peter v. 10, with *eternal* glory. Revelation xiv. 6, the *everlasting* Gospel. From these examples of the use of the term αἰώνιος in the Old Testament and in the New, it would seem to be very evident, that, though the term is sometimes used in a loose and sometimes in a stricter signification, the idea of *duration* of greater or less extent is always implied in it. This appears from the subjects to which the word is applied, and the things with which it is contrasted. It also appears that the term is generally correctly translated in the Common Version, and also that the translators regarded the Saxon term *everlasting* as entirely synonymous, when applied to life and punishment, with the Latin term *eternal*. When the word αἰώνιος or the corresponding Hebrew term עוֹלָם is translated *everlasting* and *eternal* in the same verse, it was probably so rendered by King James's translators and their predecessors for the sake of euphony. Thus, in Jeremiah xxiii. 40, I will bring an *everlasting* reproach upon you, and a *perpetual* shame, &c., the original for both words is the same in both the Hebrew and Greek. If we supposed that any one, after examining the passages which we have adduced, could doubt whether the idea of duration belongs to αἰώνιος, as its constant signification, we might amply establish the opinion which we have maintained, by the etymology of the term, and by parallel expressions in the Scriptures.

Nor is it very clear to us what idea Professor Maurice intends to substitute in the term αἰώνιος in place of the idea of duration. We thought at first that he had got upon the same track with a former respected contributor to our Journal, who several years ago made an attempt to show that the term in question, when applied to the punishment of the wicked and the blessedness of the righteous, should be translated *spiritual*;^{*} an attempt in which he succeeded in convincing few of our own, and still fewer, if possible, of any other denomination. That term, being a very general one, may be substituted for *everlasting* or *eternal* in some passages without making nonsense, but in others it cannot. It is altogether opposed, as we have seen, to the Scriptural usage in rela-

^{*} See Christian Examiner, Vol. V. Old Series, and Vols. IV., V., VII. and IX. New Series.

tion to the term, and to the considerations which have been, and others which might be, adduced. Besides, if the speaker or writer had wished to express the idea indicated by our word *spiritual*, there was a common word in Greek, πνευματικός, which he would undoubtedly have used. But on closer examination, Professor Maurice does not appear to have adopted the view of Mr. Goodwin. He admits and maintains that *eternal* is the correct translation of αἰώνιος, but distinguishes it from *everlasting*, and excludes the idea of duration from it. But what quality or condition is expressed by the term, he does not tell us with any definiteness. To say that it expresses a certain something, "independent of our time notions and earth relations," is to say nothing positive at all. What is that certain something? It has occurred to us that Professor Maurice supposed *eternal* to express a simple and undefinable idea, the positive or absolute idea of infinity; an idea which Sir William Hamilton pronounces to be an impossible attainment to the human mind. Thus he says, "Every peasant knows it as well as Newton. If you have listened with earnestness to the questions of a child, you may often think that it knows more of eternity than time. Its intuition of something beyond all dates makes you marvel." But without inquiring whether a positive idea of eternity, as applied to the Deity, and to the life of the blessed, is attainable by the human mind, we cannot see how, in consistency with his own principles, Professor Maurice can apply it to the ignorance, the wickedness, the fire, the damnation, the punishment, of those who know not God. This, then, would not seem to be his meaning. What then is it? The nearest approach to a definition of his meaning is in the Letter to Dr. Jelf, p. 16. "The word αἰώνιος, or *eternus*, seems to have been divinely contrived to raise us out of our time notions, — to express those spiritual or heavenly things which are *subject to no change or succession*." Well, suppose that such a meaning might be applied to the Deity, or even to the life of the blessed, how, on his own principles, is it applicable to the ignorance of God, the perversity, the fire, the punishment, which are the portion of the wicked? How much more hopeful is it to depart into *unchanging* fire, and *unchanging* punishment, than into *everlasting* fire, and *everlasting* punishment? Let

any one, moreover, apply the idea of unchangeableness to many of the subjects to which *αἰώνιος* is applied in the Old and New Testaments, and he will find the result to be nonsense.

Perhaps, in opposition to what has been adduced in regard to the use of the term *αἰώνιος* in the Old Testament and the New, it may be contended that our Saviour infused a new meaning into the word, as he did into the terms *Messiah, kingdom of God, &c.* But there is not the slightest indication that Christ used the term under consideration in any other than its common acceptance. In favor of his notion of excluding the idea of duration from the term, Professor Maurice adduces such passages as John xvii. 3, *This is life eternal, to know thee, the only true God, &c.* He that believeth on me *hath* everlasting life. He seems to suppose that these passages imply that eternity is experienced by the Christian on earth. But to these passages two satisfactory explanations may be given, in perfect consistency with the common meaning of *eternal* and *everlasting*. The first is founded on the well-known fact, that in such propositions the predicate often denotes the consequences of any thing, and the subject the cause, or the means by which it is procured. Thus, in Proverbs ix. 22, *My sayings are life to them that find them, i. e. give life*; x. 29, *The way of the Lord is strength to the upright, i. e. imparts strength*. John vi. 63, *The words that I speak to you are life, i. e. give life*. "Where ignorance is bliss," &c. The meaning of John xvii. 3, therefore, may be, that life eternal is the consequence of knowing the only true God, &c. In regard to the expression "*hath* everlasting life," the use of the present for the future is a common idiom in the Gospel of John. It is also a common idiom of the Hebrew language, and of course of the New Testament Greek, to use the present for the future, where the certainty of a promise or prediction is denoted. But, secondly, supposing, what is not improbable, that our Saviour meant to declare that the knowledge and love of God, or the faith in Christ which leads to it, constitute the very essence of everlasting or eternal life, or that this life begins on earth, it is by no means implied that eternity is experienced on earth, but only that the life of the blessed is *in part* experienced here. Professor Maurice applies to

the whole phrase "eternal life," and "eternal death," what is included in the terms "life" and "death," according to Scriptural usage, without any epithet annexed. It is no doubt true, that the blessed life of the Christian is begun on earth, and consummated in heaven. But there is still another idea connected by our Saviour with this life in the word *eternal*, namely, that it will be *enduring*; that it will *endure* for ever. "Your fathers," says he, in another passage, "ate manna and died. He that eateth of this bread shall live for ever." So the Apostle Paul, "Prophecies shall fail and tongues shall cease, but charity never faileth."

On the whole, therefore, we leave the Essay and Letter of Professor Maurice with the conviction, that, though his general doctrinal view is agreeable to reason, to the attributes of God, to the character of Christ, and to the spirit of the Gospel, his mode of defending it, so far as the meaning of the term *αἰώνιος* is concerned, is dark, confused, and utterly erroneous. The writer has yet to learn to study the Scriptures by the help of lexicon and concordance, and to bend his mind to a conformity with established principles of interpretation. Spiritual discernment, or that Divine inspiration which Professor Maurice claims for the true Christian, is a mighty help for the attainment of truth. We cheerfully concede to him the possession of it in large measure. But when one undertakes to give the meaning of a teacher or writer, it is a sin against the Holy Spirit, as well as against common sense, to set, at defiance the established laws of language.

And now, perhaps, some reader, if any have followed us thus far, may have the curiosity to ask, what is our mode of escaping from the conclusion, that the fearful doctrine which Professor Maurice has called in question, the doctrine of the endless punishment of the wicked, is a doctrine of Christ. We cannot, at the close of an article already long, go into a full examination of so important a subject. We will content ourselves with making a few remarks on one of the principal passages relating to it, namely, Matthew xxv. 46. Many of our remarks, however, will apply as well to other passages, particularly those containing the words *for ever and ever*; the word *αἰώνιος* being derived from the noun *αἰών*, which

is thus translated. We set out, however, with the declaration, that we do not undertake to maintain positively and with confidence, that our Saviour did *not* understand the term *αἰώνιος*, or rather the Hebrew עולם or the Syriac ܥܠܡ as denoting *everlasting* or *eternal* in the strictest sense. But we will endeavor to show that we have good reasons for entertaining strong doubts whether he did, and for believing that he understood the term in a mitigated sense, as implying long duration, but not eternity in the metaphysical sense of the expression; or at least, that he meant the whole passage Matt. xxv. 41–46 to be understood in a sense not inconsistent with forgiveness of sin and restoration to holiness in the world to come. We allow also, and maintain, that the Common Version gives as correct a translation of the verse under consideration, as any which the English language admits, though, to avoid misapprehension, it would have been better to use the same word in both parts of the sentence. We should prefer, "These shall go away into *everlasting* punishment, but the righteous into *everlasting* life," as it is rendered in the version of Wicliffe, and as he renders the term throughout the New Testament. But we have no objection to the word *eternal*, as in this connection it would have precisely the same import.

But that the proposition may be understood as not declaring the strict eternity of the punishment of the wicked in the metaphysical sense of the term, is rendered probable from the following considerations.

1. The Greek word *αἰώνιος*, and still more the corresponding Hebrew, Chaldee, and Syriac terms, are, in their ordinary, and not exceptional, signification, used in a more indefinite sense, and with a much wider application, than the English words *everlasting* and *eternal*. This appears from all the lexicons,* from the numerous passages above quoted from the Old Testament and the New, and from many others, which might be adduced. These passages show that the original term denotes long and indefinite duration, whether relating to the past or the future, and that it is often applied to things which have had a beginning, and which have had, or will have, an end. Thus it is applied to the Mosaic statutes, to

* See especially Gesenius on עולם, and Schleusner, Wahl, and Robinson on αἰώνιος.

the Jewish priesthood, to the time in which a person might be held as a slave, to the doors of the temple, to ways, to landmarks, to waste places, to the possession of the land of Canaan, to the times of the ancient prophets, to the mountains and hills, and other similar things. On the other hand, it appears with equal clearness that the term is applied to God, to the spirit of God, and to the future happiness of the good, as denoting the longest conceivable duration, duration without beginning or without end. But whether long continued or whether infinite duration is denoted, cannot be determined from the word itself. This must be determined from the subject to which it is applied, from the connection, and other considerations. In fact, the different meanings so run into each other, that it is sometimes difficult to say which meaning is intended.

2. There is a popular use of language for the purpose of impression, and a philosophical use of language for the purpose of the accurate statement of a doctrine. There is also a plain, proper use of language, and an emotional, figurative, hyperbolical use of it, in which expressions must be very much limited by the reader or hearer before they can be understood as representing literal truth. Now the expressions *everlasting* fire, *everlasting* punishment, occur in a passage which all regard as in a high degree figurative; in which, for the purpose of vivid impression, the great truth that all men will be rewarded or punished according to their deeds, to their conformity to the laws of Christ, is set forth in a kind of scenical representation borrowed from the style of Oriental judicature. In such a passage a strict, metaphysical use of language is not to be expected, but the reverse. But it will be asked, Would our Saviour have used figurative or hyperbolical language on so important a subject? I answer, that highly figurative or hyperbolical language may almost be styled the common dialect of Orientals. Compare John iii. 26, "Behold, the same baptizeth, and *all* men come to him"; and verse 32, "And what he hath seen and heard he testifieth, and *no* man receiveth his testimony." Was it not hyperbolical language when our Saviour told the Pharisees that they made their proselytes *twofold* more the children of hell than themselves; when he threatened that *all* the righteous blood from the

time of Abel should be visited on that generation; when he said that the sin against the Holy Ghost should *never* be forgiven *in this world*, or in that which is to come? And was it not hyperbolical language, we would ask the advocate of endless torments, when he said, "I, if I be lifted up, shall draw *all* men unto me"? Of this hyperbolical use of language there is a striking instance in Psalm xxi. 4, "He asked life of thee, and thou gavest it him, even length of days *for ever and ever*." In our own language a similar usage prevails. Thus we hear of the *eternal* disputes about the slavery question, of *perpetual* trouble, *endless* vexation, *everlasting* disquiet. We do not say that any of these expressions are exactly parallel with those of our Saviour in the verse before us; but they show that his language may have been used in a hyperbolical, or, at least, in a loose, popular sense, unless there be some decisive consideration which leads to an opposite conclusion.

3. It is important to be observed, that the great design, the subject-matter, of the passage in which the term under consideration is contained, was not the settlement of any question respecting the duration of future punishment. The design of the passage was to exhibit the hateful nature of sin, the awful consequences which attend it, and the exclusion of all sin and misery from the kingdom of Christ in its consummation. If the question had been expressly proposed to Jesus, how long the punishment of the wicked would endure, and he had intended to answer that it would be strictly endless, we admit that *αἰώνιος*,* or rather the corresponding Syro-chaldaic term, would in all probability have been used. But it cannot be pretended that such a question had been raised. Our Saviour was answering no doctrinal question, and laying down no dogma or principle, essential to be believed, concerning the duration of the punishment of every individual. He did not undertake to decide the point which is now in dispute in reference to the duration of punishment. His evident design was to impress upon his hearers the great truth, that, when his kingdom should be completely established, the retributions of sin would

* It is doubtful whether *αἰδιος*, or *ἀένναος*, is a stronger expression. The former occurs in the New Testament only twice, Rom. i. 20 and Jude 6, the latter a few times in the Septuagint.

be terrible in their nature, and lasting in their duration. It was not necessary for this purpose, that the terms which he employed should be understood in a strict or philosophical sense, and as laying down an absolute dogma in regard to the duration of the punishment of individual sinners. If our Saviour had been asked, whether it was not possible that some youth, who was cut down before he had heard his voice, might have an opportunity of faith and repentance in the future life, would he not have answered, Him that cometh to me, at whatever time, and from whatever place, I will by no means cast out? Or, if he had been asked whether punishment were strictly endless, would he not at least have answered, It is endless only for those who persevere for ever in wickedness, who resist for ever that Divine grace which never will be withdrawn; but so long as sin exists misery must exist with it?*

If we have been correct in our statements, there is no ground in the word *αἰώνιος*, in itself considered, or in the general character of the passage in which it occurs, in favor of giving it its strict and metaphysical rather than its looser signification. But there is one consideration which favors a different conclusion, namely, the antithesis of *everlasting* punishment to *everlasting* life. In the phrase *everlasting life*, here and elsewhere, it is said, the term must be used in its most unrestricted sense. To this we answer, that the word must undoubtedly be used in the same general signification in both clauses of the verse. But in view of what has been said of the manner in which the different meanings of the original term run into each other, of the popular character of the language, and of the general design and highly figurative character of the whole passage, we do not think it necessary to construe it so strictly when applied to the subject of punishment, which must be according to one's deeds, as when applied to the blessed life, which is not the re-

* This *hypothetical* doctrine of endless punishment is maintained by Nitzsch, in his *System der Christlichen Lehre*, which is the most popular work on systematic theology in Germany, and is generally regarded as orthodox. See page 416, sixth edition. The English translation of this work is the worst specimen of translation from the German which we have ever seen. There is not a page in which some misrepresentation of the meaning of the author does not occur. The above-mentioned view was also maintained by Schott, in his *Epitome Theologiæ*, p. 131, and, in the last century, by Doederlein, in his *Instit. Theol.*, Vol. II. p. 188.

ward of merit, but the gift of God to those who have faith and righteousness. And why should we suppose the word to be used in a strict metaphysical sense in either clause of the verse? If the promise of a life of blessedness of long, indefinite duration is given to the Christian, can he not trust the grace of the Everlasting Father, that he will not annihilate a holy and happy being? Suppose that we should construe Matthew xii. 28 as strictly as some construe the verse under consideration, would it not follow, that all sins *except* the sin against the Holy Ghost *might* be forgiven in the world to come, as well as in this world? In fact, this verse was so understood by no less a saint than Augustine.*

4. That the verse under consideration may be understood in such a sense as not to exclude the opportunity of faith and repentance in the future world, is favored by the character of God as revealed and manifested in Christ, and by the mild and merciful character of Christ himself, who knows how to have compassion on our infirmities. This last consideration certainly belongs to the province of interpretation. All writers on hermeneutics lay it down as a principle, that language is to be interpreted in harmony with the known character and sentiments of the speaker or writer. Even in the writings of Paul, who is very strong in denouncing punishment against the wicked, there are passages in which he speaks of the purposes of God, and of the riches of his grace, in such a manner as to make it difficult to believe that he contemplated the strictly eternal punishment of all who die in sin. We refer to the manner in which he speaks of the salvation of all Israel in Romans xi., and the putting down of all enemies to the kingdom of Christ in 1 Corinthians xv. 25-28. We cannot, indeed, find an express declaration in the Scriptures of the final salvation of all men. Enemies may be put under one's feet by confinement in a place of punishment, as well as by being converted into friends. But the spirit of those passages, which makes so much to depend on

* He says, in a passage which we translate literally, "as in the resurrection of the dead there will be some, who, after the punishment which the spirits of the dead suffer, will receive mercy, so that they will not be cast into everlasting fire. For it could not with truth be said of some, that their sins would not be forgiven in this world, or in that which is to come, unless there were others who would be forgiven in the world to come, though not in this world." — *De Civitate Dei*, Lib. XXI. Cap. XXIV. § 2.

means which the wisdom and mercy of God have, as it were, in reserve, is not very favorable to the doctrine of the endless misery of all who are leaving the world with a sinful character, or who have left it since the creation of man. The thought of Paul logically carried out leads to a very different conclusion, and awakens the most cheering hopes.*

In the parable of the rich man and Lazarus we have a glimpse of the change of disposition which may be effected by a change of circumstances. The rich man, who was so hard-hearted, while he lived, as to refuse to the poor beggar the crumbs which fell from his table, is represented as turning his eyes on his brethren whom he had left on earth, and longing to warn them of the consequences of sin. It seems as if his punishment had begun to work a change in his disposition; just as the prodigal son came to himself, when he was reduced to the necessity of feeding on the husks which the swine did eat. We know that the instruction from this part of the parable is only incidental, and formed not its express design. But still it was suggested by Christ in view of what he knew of the effect of punishment on the human heart.

But the most direct testimony from the New Testament for the possible recovery from sin and punishment in the future world, is to be found in the First Epistle of Peter. There we read expressly, ch. iii. 18, 19, that our Saviour after his death went and preached to the spirits in prison, who had been disobedient while they

* The impartial and sharp-sighted De Wette finds still more actually expressed in 1 Corinthians xv. 25-28 than we can. He says in his Commentary *ad loc.*: "The idea of the restoration of all things is here undeniable. For if at this time there were any in a state of damnation, in whom the influence of God was felt in punishment and not in love, he would not be all in all. Also after the destruction of Satan and death, verses 24-26, damnation is no longer conceivable." Schleiermacher, after a logical discussion of the subject, says: "There are great difficulties in supposing that the final result of redemption will be such, that only some will be partakers, while others, and indeed the greater part, according to the common representation, of the whole human race, will be consigned to endless misery. We cannot receive this view without the most decisive testimony that such a result was foreseen by Christ himself. But this testimony we by no means have. With at least equal justice may we maintain the milder view, of which there are some traces in Scripture, (see 1 Corinthians xv. 26, 55,) that through the influence of the Christian redemption there will at some future time be a general restoration of all human souls." — *Christliche Glaube*, Band II. p. 505.

lived on earth; and again, ch. iv. 6, that the *glad tidings*, εὐαγγελισθη, were preached to the dead, the disobedient dead. We are aware of the extremely forced and arbitrary interpretations which have been put on these verses in modern times, partly caused by an inordinate dread of Papal superstition, and partly by objections from reason against the descent of Christ into the regions of the dead. But the great body of interpreters, of the Protestant as well as the Catholic Church, and the great body of Christians from the earliest times, have understood these verses in their obvious meaning, as asserting that Christ after his death did preach to the dead, the disobedient dead. There has also been a difference of opinion in regard to the substance of the message of Christ to the dead. But we are wholly unable to imagine how he could have announced glad tidings to them, unless he had proclaimed to them the opportunity of release from their prison through faith and repentance.* The Apostle Peter, therefore, who had a good opportunity of understanding the mind of our Lord, did not understand any denunciations of punishment, which he had heard from him, as inconsistent with an opportunity for faith, repentance, and restoration to the Divine favor in the world beyond the grave.

5. We regard it as no objection to our views, but rather a confirmation of them, that the principle on which they are founded has been held by the great majority of the Christian Church for ages. We are always glad to have a point of doctrinal contact and fellowship with Christians whose religious faith is in many respects different from our own. We know the superstitious and mercenary practices which have been connected with the Catholic doctrine of Purgatory. But so far as this article of the Catholic faith refuses to make the mere circumstance of death an insuperable bar to moral progress, and holds out the hope of forgiveness and the possibility of reformation and purification to those who enter the future world manifestly susceptible of reformation, it is an honor to the Church which makes it a part of her creed.

* Justin Martyr accuses the Jews of having abstracted a passage from Jeremiah, which affirms that the Lord "remembered his dead, which slept in the dust of the earth, and descended to them, that he might preach unto them his salvation." — *Dialogue with Trypho*, § 72.

Her honor would be greater, if she would extend her charity beyond the limits of her own communion. It is not, however, by making the Catholic doctrine of Purgatory the subject of ridicule, but by extracting from it what is true and good and consoling to weak and afflicted humanity, while we reject the errors associated with it, that we may hope to keep men from subjection to the Roman hierarchy.

In view now of all the considerations which have been, and of many other considerations which might be, mentioned, we cannot help thinking that the passage which we have examined, and similar passages, may be understood in a sense consistent with the possibility and probability of faith, regeneration, and forgiveness in the future world. We do not pretend that we can by exegetical considerations place the precise meaning of Christ's language beyond doubt in our own mind, or in the minds of others. But on the whole we have faith that the plan of the Divine government relating to the future as well as the present world is in accordance with what is beautifully intimated by the Prophet Isaiah (xxviii. 28, 29): —

"Bread-corn is thrashed ;
Yet doth not the husbandman thrash it without limit ;
He driveth over it the wheels of the wain,
And the horses, yet doth he not bruise it into pieces.
This also proceedeth from the Lord of hosts ;
He is wonderful in counsel,
Excellent in wisdom."

G. R. N.

ART. VII. — AN ORTHODOX VIEW OF THE TEMPTATION OF CHRIST.*

WE have been greatly interested in the perusal of an Article in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, by the Rev. Dr. Stearns, minister of a Trinitarian Congregational church in Cambridge, on "The Temptation in the Wilderness." Our interest was not engaged by any novel view set forth in that paper, but by the striking testimony which it

* *Bibliotheca Sacra and American Biblical Repository*, for January, 1854. Art. VIII. *The Temptation in the Wilderness*. By WILLIAM A. STEARNS, D.D.

affords to an increasing willingness, on the part of so-called Orthodox interpreters, to meet some of the suggestions presented by the text of Scripture that have often been kept out of sight, and by the accordance of a portion of Dr. Stearns's explanation with that which our brethren have often been assailed for advancing. His paper is written with admirable clearness and simplicity of style, without any parade of learning.

Our readers are all aware that the narrative of the Saviour's temptation is one of those passages of the Bible which warrant the reception of one great canon of criticism, — that we must avail ourselves of the relief afforded by the figurative style of representation often adopted in it, if we would avoid downright absurdities and monstrous conclusions. True, our opponents have rung the changes upon the charge alleged against us, of explaining away the statements of Scripture by metaphors and the license of language; but they do not seem to be aware that they avail themselves of that privilege as much, or even more, than we do, only that it suits them to explain differently what all of us have to explain in some way. But if the principle be allowed, that the strict letter of Scripture may be departed from, sound judgment is made the arbiter in each case.

There was a favorite theory entertained among the old divines, that the insane, the epileptic, and the dumb, whom the Saviour relieved of their miseries, and who are described as "*possessed*" persons, were actually victims into whose bodies infernal spirits had been allowed to enter for the purpose of being ejected by Christ, in order that his divine power over devils might be visibly manifested, while he was upon the earth. The narrative of the temptation of Christ was also generally taken in the strictness of the letter. We have now before us a venerable copy of the English Book of Common Prayer, which is hard on to two hundred years old, and which bears the tokens of having been reverently valued by former owners. It is profusely illustrated by quaint engravings of Scripture scenes and characters, and an effigy of James II. makes its frontispiece. Among these devices is a complete pictorial representation of The Temptation. First, the Saviour is pictured, as he entered the wilderness for his trial. He is seated by the

roots of a large tree, with a *glory* around his head, while three little quadrupeds, of a most questionable physiognomy, though they may be designed for hares and other field creatures, are playing by his feet. Then we have before us two figures, one of the Saviour still with the raying glory, the other of the Arch-tempter, whose form is covered with a long robe, while his horns and hoofs, and two stones which he is proffering to Jesus, leave nothing to be imagined which the skill of the engraver could supply. Next, the Saviour is seen standing upon the topmost height of the temple, from which he appears to have just pushed off the Adversary, who, happily for himself, though unhappily for us, if he would otherwise have perished by the fall, is supplied with a good pair of wings. In the third temptation, the two figures are again seen standing upon the table summit of a mountain, while Satan, looking like an erect bear with long ears, is pointing out the prospect to the holy being whom he sought to beguile. Finally, the Saviour, no longer haunted by that foul shape, is pictured as seated at a table, while four kneeling angels are proffering him the viands with which it is spread.

The question of an intelligent child, on viewing these engravings, would doubtless be, whether the hideous and hateful form and presence of the Tempter would not be likely so to disgust the holy eye that was looking upon him, as to defeat the very object of his coming. Most probably this would have been the case. The engraver ought at least to have availed himself of the Scripture assertion, that "Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light," and so have given him an outward seeming which would have helped his alluring speeches to one on whom all his arts were needed. At any rate, if the child does not ask the question just stated, we do; and we apprehend that Dr. Stearns also has asked it of himself. He alludes to what some regard as the absurd and shocking suppositions, that Christ was led about from place to place by Satan in bodily form, and followed that diabolical guidance, or was carried through the air by the Tempter, and he asks the very pertinent but most *unorthodox* question, "What reason is there for supposing a bodily presence?" We might answer the writer, that there is the same reason for supposing the

bodily presence of such a tempter, as there is for accepting the doctrine of his actual personal existence; namely, the positive assertion of Scripture, when taken *in the letter*. In that personal existence Dr. Stearns believes, but in that visible bodily presence he does not believe, and we are at a loss to discern any good reason for this discrimination in the exercise of his faith. Does not this instance illustrate the fact, that it is not Unitarian critics alone who avail themselves of a recourse to the license of figurative language, to meet some of the verbal difficulties of Scripture? The charge has been reiterated against us, that we explain away what we do not choose to receive. But where all classes of interpreters do this under the cover of figurative language, it would seem as if the critical canon were established, while the only question left open is as to its right application in any particular case. Now there are no more positive words used in the Bible, expressive of the actual personal existence of Satan, than are used to signify his actual, visible, bodily appearance to the Saviour. It is said that the Devil "came to Jesus"; that "he *said*" several distinct things to him; that "he *taketh* him up into the holy city, and *setteth* him on a pinnacle of the temple"; that "he *taketh* him up into" a mountain, "and *showeth* him all the kingdoms of the world," &c., and made him a very positive offer on a condition; and, finally, it is said that he "*leaveth*" Jesus "for a season." But how is it that all these verbs of speech, action, and motion lose their literal signification in this instance, and become merely figurative, while the little verb of *existence*, which states in some of its tenses the *personality* of a spirit of wickedness, must be religiously held to for the letter of what it asserts? Let the excellent divine whose views we are commenting upon reply.

Again, speaking of *the nature of the Saviour's fasting*, Dr. Stearns says: "The fast of forty days may have been more or less rigid. Fasting implies sometimes partial, and sometimes total abstinence. When Luke says, that 'in those days he did eat nothing,' he may mean that he had no regular supplies, that he subsisted only on the roots and wild fruits which he found in the desert." We accord in the supposition. But by what rule of criticism does Dr. Stearns define *nothing* as

meaning "roots and wild fruits"? There is a rule, we know, to justify him, but we submit that he applies that rule arbitrarily in his own case, and denies the privilege of it to others.

"The Spirit of God," says our writer, "led the Son of God into temptation," as it was "a part of God's plan that his Son should come into conflict with the Prince of evil, and get the mastery of him." As to the question, how a perfectly holy being could possibly be tempted, Dr. Stearns argues, "We have only to remember that our Saviour, though divine, was perfectly human." We do indeed *remember* that this assertion has been often made; but to us it cannot convey any intelligible idea, or be any thing short of a downright absurdity and impossibility. Jesus is presented to us as *one* being, with a nature and with endowments bestowed upon him by the God whom he called "his Father and our Father, his God and our God." Trinitarians affirm, that besides this nature he had another, as one of the Trinity in the Godhead, and that he interchanged from hour to hour, and in the course of one strain of teaching, these two characters of his, — not informing his hearers when he made the transition, and thus introducing inextricable confusion into all our conceptions of him. This alleged duplication of natures and characters may find a parallel in some points in supposing a case thus. There are business men around us who pursue some of their enterprises in their individual capacity, on private capital, taking their own risks, meeting their private losses, and enjoying their private gains, — while at the same time such men may be partners in a firm of three persons, in another branch of business, in which they have embarked another portion of their capital, subject to other contingencies. A man may certainly have such private business as an individual, and such partnership business as a member of a firm: there is no doubt about that. But suppose we were to say, that what such a man gains or loses as a member of a firm is no loss or gain to him as an individual; — or further, suppose we say that such a man is shrewd, or sharp, or liberal, or honest, as one of three, but reckless or dishonest as a business man by himself. Should we not introduce a strange confusion into the elements of his individuality? Such confusion there

appears to us to be in asserting that Jesus as a human being could be ignorant of what he knew as one of the Trinity, or could be subjected to temptation in one capacity and not in the other.

Trinitarians profess to find relief from this perplexity by calling it *a mystery*. It is indeed a mystery, or rather a mystification, but it is one wholly of their own contriving. Peter's direct assertion concerning Jesus, that he was "a man approved of God by signs and wonders which God did through him," — that is, that he was a being in human form miraculously endowed by the Almighty, — covers and explains satisfactorily every line and word that refers to Jesus, from the beginning to the end of the Bible.

Then as to the personal existence of a Devil Dr. Stearns says, "This *individual*, a mighty, mysterious, fallen intelligence, not, however, omniscient nor omnipotent, the head of a great organized opposition to God, the Arch-foe of man and the Prince of evil, is *the agent* by whom Jesus is tempted." To the suggestion, that some have regarded the narrative as "representing a conflict on the part of Christ with impersonal evil," the writer replies, "There is hardly more reason for supposing that what is here called the Devil is impersonal, than to suppose that what is here called Jesus is impersonal. The principle of interpretation which would remove the evil agent, as an agent, from the record, would remove our Saviour himself from the record, as an agent." It is strange that such a cultivated mind should mystify its own clear conceptions and turn upon its own assertions. May we not say to Dr. Stearns, in rigid conformity with what we have just quoted from him, that the same process which rids the scene from the *bodily presence* of the Devil, rids it also of the bodily presence of Jesus? By what an amazing inconsistency does the critic deny that *bodily presence*, and yet affirm a *personal presence*!

Of course, though without the slightest shadow of reason, (considering his own mode of dealing with the letter of the narrative,) Dr. Stearns rejects Farmer's explanation of the account, as exhibiting the conflict of the Saviour in retirement, at the opening of his ministry, with the three leading temptations which would address him in its course. He says, "On exegetical grounds, we can

no more explain away the reality of the Temptation, than we can explain away the reality of the Saviour's baptism, his agony in the garden, or even his crucifixion." True. But what constituted that *reality* of the temptation? It was just as *real* in Farmer's view of it as in that of Dr. Stearns.

"The Prince of evil," he says, "is a spirit," and he came as a spirit to Christ, concealing his true character because his hope of success depended on such concealment. What follows partakes of the confusion of which we have already made mention.

"But supposing only a spiritual presence [of the Devil], it is said the Saviour must have known, at once, both the Tempter and his designs, and have refused all converse with him. But this proceeds on the supposition that Jesus, as a man, knew all things, a sentiment which the Scripture expressly contradicts. That he was Divine as well as human, and that, when he called his Divine nature into exercise, he was omniscient by the power of it, no orthodox Christian will deny. But that he was also human, and that, as such, his faculties were subject to human limitations, every reader of the New Testament confesses." The writer affirms, in proof of this astonishing statement, that Jesus was at the crucifixion "bereft for a time of all consciousness of God's presence." This construction is put upon the repetition by the Saviour of the first words of a Psalm which goes on to express the sublimest trust in God, and, instead of uttering fixed despair, assures the Saviour's own confidence that his Father would have answered his prayer had he asked for "twelve legions of angels."

"The suggestions of the Tempter" are explained in the same way by Dr. Stearns as by Farmer, allowing for the idea of the former that Satan was spiritually, though not bodily or visibly, present. The temptation to supply his hunger by the use of his miraculous powers was at once repelled. Dr. Stearns supposes that the Saviour then went from the desert to Jerusalem, and actually mounted a pinnacle of the temple, while he was tempted to make a marvellous display of his power by leaping down unharmed. This concession, again, is made for the sake of an adherence to the strict letter of the narrative. But even here the writer fails to honor the

letter. For it is not said that Jesus *went* to Jerusalem and *mounted* a pinnacle, but that Satan *took* him to the city and *set* him on that airy height. More remarkable still is the writer's attempt to honor the very letter in explaining the assertion, that from a high mountain Satan showed Jesus all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them, in a moment of time. He thinks that Jesus actually ascended such a mountain, and "had an instantaneous view of the leading kingdoms of the earth." It is easy to understand this temptation as a mental operation. But if Dr. Stearns really knows of any mountain which admits of a prospect any thing like what he describes, we have no doubt some of our panorama painters would be glad to avail themselves of it. We should deem a position on the moon rather more eligible than any position on this curved earth for such a view.

Our attention and thought have been attracted to the essay which we have been examining, because we always read with interest the productions of the respected author, and because the pages which we have reviewed represent the method of dealing with the text of Scripture that still insists upon their literal interpretation in theory, but departs from it in practice. Dr. Stearns thinks that the actual personal existence of a Devil is one of the most positive doctrines in the New Testament. But there is not a single passage in Scripture which may not be relieved of that inference as easily as the essay before us rids the temptation of Jesus of the visible presence of the tempter. Besides, there are many references to such an agency, which positively require us to regard the words *Devil* and *Satan* as simply personifications of evil. What did the Saviour mean when he said, "I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven"? To say nothing of the implication that Satan, if in heaven, was out of his place, does the passage assert a literal sight of his descent? But if it be answered that the vision is figurative, why may we not say the same of the object of the vision, and render the passage, "I saw the power of wickedness falling from its high place, and yielding to the might of holiness and truth"? When Jesus says to the Pharisees, "Ye are of your father, the Devil," does he really imply that they were the chil-

dren of that Evil One? If he did, they certainly might have quoted one of the commandments, — "Honor thy father," — as a reason for their allegiance to the Devil. The Saviour distinctly addresses Peter as Satan; and again, the Saviour tells Peter that Satan is aiming to seize him that he may sift him as wheat; and once more, the same Peter tells us that "the Devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about," &c. We submit that even the last three passages of Scripture, to say nothing of others which might be quoted, can be brought into one consistent view only by a principle of interpretation that will recognize Satan as the personification of evil or wickedness.

G. E. E.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Christ in History; or the Central Power among Men. By ROBERT TURNBULL, D.D. Boston: Phillips, Sampson, & Co. London: Sampson Low, Son, & Co. 1854. 12mo. pp. 540.

DR. TURNBULL has brought together, within a small compass and with much freshness and vigor of style, the best results of ancient and modern thought upon his important theme. He modestly says, that, "though the labor of years, it is not offered as any thing approaching a complete or scientific view of the subject, but rather as a slight contribution or preparation for such a view"; and his work will be found of great service in arousing the attention and guiding the inquiries of the student who craves something better than the superficial theories of atheistical, pantheistical, or deistical historians. The manifestation of God in Christ is indeed the crowning fact in the history of the world, and, in a very high and large sense, all that was done and suffered by man before the Saviour's coming may be regarded as a prophecy of that Gospel which all subsequent history fulfils. It is exceedingly important that our ripening scholars should be led into such trains of thought and observation as are developed in this interesting work. We have noticed two or three errors, which it may be well to specify, although we are not sure that they have not already caught the author's eye. On the twenty-ninth and thirtieth pages, Kant is represented as

showing in his "Kritik of the Pure Reason," that man "has affinities and relations with infinite perfection and immortal existence," and the title just given is Germanized in a parenthesis as "*Der Praktischen Vernunft*." Now, Kant did nothing of the kind in his "Kritik of the Pure Reason," but did attempt something of the sort in a supplementary treatise upon the Practical Reason, which Dr. Turnbull probably had in mind, for "*Der Praktischen Vernunft*" means "Of the Practical Reason." Again, Mr. Theodore Parker is represented as a disciple of Strauss, and as having reproduced his views for the benefit of American readers. Now, if we are not in error, Mr. Parker has had no direct connection with Strauss, save in attempting, as once in our own pages, to discredit his theory. Both these writers reject the Gospels as authentic histories, but they are not at all agreed as to the way in which their origin is to be explained. Indeed, Mr. Parker does not insist, if we have understood him, upon any particular theory. Moreover, though this is not directly to the point, Strauss is a Pantheist, according to Dr. Turnbull, whose testimony is, we believe, correct, whilst Mr. Parker is a Deist, or Theist, as he prefers to be called, and a very admirable one too, besides believing most heartily in a conscious immortality of the human soul, to say nothing of the immortality, unconscious, we presume, of sparrows and the rest of the animal creation. It is exceedingly important to keep the different shades of opinion distinct, and not float in the same boat all those who happen to agree in some one important point.

A Compendium of the Theological and Spiritual Writings of EMANUEL SWEDENBORG: being a Systematic and Orderly Epitome of all his Religious Works; selected from more than Thirty Volumes, etc., etc., prefaced by a full Life of the Author; with a brief View of all his Works on Science, Philosophy, and Theology. Boston: Crosby, Nichols, & Co. 1853. 8vo. pp. 674.

A COMPENDIUM, but formidable at that, for the octavo does not lack much of being a quarto, and the book is arranged in double columns, which are very closely printed. Still, a compilation that would do justice to a writer so voluminous at once and various as Swedenborg could not be brought within less compass. We have from time to time, as opportunities have offered, endeavored to form and express a fair estimate of the claims, natural and supernatural, of the great Swedish philosopher and theologian, and although we have not been persuaded to enroll ourselves amongst his disciples, we have never felt the

slightest temptation to treat his opinions with neglect or with lightness. Indeed, we are satisfied that the theology of Swedenborg was an immense advance upon the religious sentiments which were entertained by the majority of his contemporaries. The "Compendium" seems to us admirably adapted to aid the student of divinity and the general scholar in gaining what no one who aspires to be an educated man can dispense with, an acquaintance with the life and thoughts of this very remarkable man. Whatever may be our sentence upon his peculiar claims, he was at least gifted with a singular moral and spiritual insight, and, hard and dry as his style often is, no one can read his works without pleasure as well as profit. The introduction to the Compendium contains a vast deal of reverent and fresh thought, and will be of service to the young student. On the whole, as it is hardly possible for many persons to own, and utterly impossible for most persons to read, even so much of the writings of Swedenborg as has been given to the public, and as a portion of his writings must and should be read, the compiler of this book seems to us to have done a good work.

The Complete Poetical Works of THOMAS CAMPBELL ; with an original Biography and Notes. Edited by EPES SARGENT. Boston : Phillips, Sampson, & Co. 1854. 12mo. pp. 479.

THE chief feature in this beautiful edition of Campbell's poems is the very full and excellent Life of the poet by Mr. Sargent. It is written in a clear and graceful style, and embodies in a brief space all those facts in relation to the poet's personal experience which the general reader would wish to know. As an interesting and well-digested memoir, it is much superior to Dr. Beattie's ponderous volumes, from which most of the materials have been drawn. In addition to this source, however, Mr. Sargent has also made use of the biographical notices by Mr. Redding, for some years associated with Campbell in the editorial charge of the New Monthly Magazine, and of some other materials. The notes which he has appended to the volume are also valuable as elucidating any obscurities in the poems, and are a welcome addition. But we regret that it did not fall within his purpose to present a general estimate of Campbell's poetical powers and comparative position amongst his contemporaries. Nor do we find any direct criticism on either of his productions. But these are omissions which we can readily forgive, for the merit of the essay in other respects.

Campbell has always been a popular poet ; and it does not seem probable that his popularity is likely to be materially

diminished. No poet of the present century has made a more brilliant commencement of his career than was seen in the publication of "The Pleasures of Hope." And the position which this remarkable piece gave to its author, was strengthened and confirmed by the appearance of "Gertrude of Wyoming." If his other long poems add nothing to his reputation, his fame was already secure. As a lyric poet he ranks among the first that his country has ever produced. His lyrics have a fire and brilliancy, and his whole verse an exquisite polish, which must always cause his poems to be read with satisfaction. In the edition before us, about fifty poems are included which have not heretofore been comprised in any edition. Many of them are of great beauty, and all will be read with pleasure by his admirers.

The Breughel Brothers, from the German of the BARON VON STERNBERG. By G. HENRY LODGE. Designs by Billings. Engravings by Baker, Smith, & Andrew. Boston: Little, Brown, & Co. 1854. Sq. 8vo. pp. 187.

The *Kunstnovelle* or *Kunstroman* (Art-novel) is a species of literary composition almost peculiar to Germany. At least it has been more extensively and more successfully cultivated there than in any other country. Wagner's "Travelling Painter," Heinse's "Ardinghello," Tieck's "Heart Outpourings of a Cloister Brother," his "Sternbald's Wanderings," and Fr. Schlegel's "Lucinde," are among the best-known specimens of this style of fiction. Goethe's "Wilhelm Meister" may also be termed an Art-novel, but in a higher sense and with a higher aim than those we have mentioned, terminating as it does with the art of all arts, — the art of life.

The Art-novel may have for its object criticisms on schools and works of art, or art-philosophy, or portraiture of artist-characters and artist-life. It is the last of these which characterizes "The Breughel Brothers." Every one has heard of the two Breughels, (sons of old Peter Breughel, distinguished by their contemporaries as "Hell Breughel" and "Velvet Breughel,") who give the name to this work. It is a series of pictures, in which the principal figures are Flemish painters, boldly drawn and warmly colored, somewhat in the tone of Rubens, but with far more tenderness than ever belonged to the great master of Antwerp.

We are unacquainted with the German of Von Sternberg, but we doubt not that the translation by Dr. Lodge is as faithful in the rendering as it is finished in its diction. It is translated much, rather than little, but we think not overmuch.

The translator of Winckelmann is too well known, and too sincerely honored by all who have bestowed attention on his labors, to need any commendation from us. That translation is a work which, both in the motive and the manner, is as creditable to American authorship, as it is serviceable to American Art. Next to the practical artist, he serves the cause of Art most effectually who helps to diffuse the knowledge of its principles, and thus to promote sound judgment on the subject.

We must express our gratification with the very superior manner in which the mechanical execution of this volume has been accomplished, under the superintendence of Messrs. Little, Brown, & Co., the publishers.

Essays on Philosophical Writers, and other Men of Letters.

By THOMAS DE QUINCEY. Boston: Ticknor, Reed, & Fields. 1854. In Two Volumes. 16mo. pp. 292, 291.

Letters to a Young Man, and other Papers. By THOMAS DE QUINCEY. Boston: Ticknor, Reed, & Fields. 1854. 16mo. pp. 300.

THREE more volumes of De Quincey's writings will find a most hearty welcome from those readers who have long been familiar with the productions of his facile and elaborate scholarship, or who have made their first acquaintance with him through the beautiful edition of his collected works, for which we are indebted to Mr. Fields. The series already embraces fifteen volumes, and as each of them has appeared we have not failed to make mention of their attractive contents. Upon a most interesting page in one of these new volumes (*Letters to a Young Man, &c.*, page 9), the author gives us some particulars concerning his own life of study, which explain the history of his mental acquisitions and training. We must confess that he has the faculty of bringing out his incidental knowledge in a way to confound many readers with amazement at its amount. The strength of his prejudices, too, is apparent on every page that he writes. It would not do to accept his judgment, either of men or of theories, as formed without a strong personal bias of his own, for it is evident that he is a terrible hater, and no man can do justice to any thing which he thoroughly hates unless the thing hated be sin: perhaps even that ought not to be excepted.

Sir William Hamilton, Sir James Mackintosh, Kant, Herder, Richter, and Lessing are the subjects of *Essays* which fill one of the volumes before us, while Bentley and Parr are discussed and portrayed in another. The sketches of the last two characters are all the more valuable, because the more copious biographies

of them, from which chiefly De Quincey has drawn his materials, are two of the least skilful works in that rich department of literature. We have managed to deal with Dr. Monk's solid quarto upon Bentley, by skipping or skimming two pages out of three, but after trying the same process upon Dr. Johnstone's Life of Parr, we were compelled to leave our mark midway in the volume, and to lay it aside. We cannot commend De Quincey for rigid impartiality in his judgment of either of these famous men, but he has certainly presented them to us in a most vigorous and masterly style. The sketch of the Phalaris controversy in the Essay on Bentley affords a fine specimen of a judicial statement of an issue depending upon sound scholarship and curious niceties of argument. De Quincey deals too leniently with his hero's emendations of the *Paradise Lost*. We cannot but regard it as a substantial abatement of Bentley's praise for solid wisdom, that he should have tried his hand upon that silly task. A man who is endowed with the highest discernment, and has acquired all the safeguards of true discretion, will never be the victim of such an egregious blunder as Bentley made when he — to speak plainly — made such a fool of himself.

Dr. Parr meets with hard treatment from De Quincey, and were it not for a few relenting allowances, and an occasional word of encomium, we should say that party feeling and prejudice had guided the pen of the writer.

The third volume opens with a series of five "Letters to a Young Man whose Education has been neglected." They contain many delightful revelations of the pleasures and results of a scholar's life. The assertion of the practical value of a knowledge of the Latin language is emphatically substantiated, and some fine touches of critical skill gleam all over the pages. Besides these Letters, we have in the volume Essays on Conversation, on Language, on French and English Manners, on California and the Gold Mania, on Ceylon, and on Presence of Mind.

If the reader will turn to page 38th of this volume, he will find a comparative estimate of the number of books which one may be able to read in a lifetime whose duration is measured by the Psalmist's seventy years. The facts there enumerated may suggest to some person the utility and the possibility of making a digest of all our existing literature. The first apprehension of De Quincey's estimate may overwhelm many with dismay at the thought of how small a portion of what is in print can be perused by them in their span of life. But it is probably true that one tenth part of all the books in the world contain in substance what is to be found in all of them. The difficulty now is to know which tenth part to look to.

A Defence of "The Eclipse of Faith," by its Author ; -being a Rejoinder to Professor Newman's "Reply." London: Longman, Brown, Green, & Longmans. 1854. 12mo. pp. 218.

THIS "Rejoinder" we think was called for, and after a careful perusal of it we must say that it is made with candor, with ability, and with a triumphant weight of argument. We have noticed in several quarters, and in some where it was not to have been expected, a depreciatory criticism of "The Eclipse of Faith," which has involved a complete misrepresentation, not to say a caricature, of its method and its principal contents. It was with great regret that we observed a measure of this same injustice toward the book in the pages of that admirable journal, "The Prospective Review." Mr. Newman's treatment of the author is simply disgraceful to himself, however much the fault of it may be palliated by the chagrin of a writer in having his own method of argument turned against himself. One specimen will serve to set before our readers an instance of the unworthy shifts to which Mr. Newman has had recourse. "The Eclipse of Faith" had met the difficulty presented by the Old Testament in its reference of the intended sacrifice of Isaac and the Canaanitish wars to the instigation of Jehovah, — as the difficulty was urged by Professor Newman, — by specifying some dark and painful facts concerning the government of God in nature and in human experience, which facts it is as difficult for the Theist to reconcile with the attributes of God, as it is for the believer in the Bible to reconcile some of its narratives with faith in the divine authority of the book. Instead of meeting this fair parallelism to his own objection by showing that it was not a parallelism, or by relieving the Almighty of certain dark dealings in his moral government, Mr. Newman turns upon our author and charges him with advocating "an *unmoral* [immoral] Deity." Now our author might justly bring this charge against Mr. Newman, unless the former denies that God allowed what the Old Testament refers to his allowance ; because Mr. Newman must ascribe those Canaanitish wars either to the instigation of a devil, or to some method of God's providence ; and as he does not believe in a devil, but does believe the wars to have been unrighteous, that unrighteousness must reflect back upon the Almighty. The author of the "Rejoinder," not without some severity of language, exposes the sophistry which has so ineffectually been brought to bear against him in this plea of "an *unmoral* Deity."

Again, our author has been censured for his use of the method of the Socratic dialogue, by which it is implied that he frames the objections and arguments of his opponents which he

intends to answer, and puts them in a form which he can answer ; thus having the privilege of pulling both the puppets in his sham trial of wits. But only a small portion of the contents of "The Eclipse of Faith" pursues this method ; and as the author honestly and candidly drew from the writers whom he controverts their own statements and arguments, he offended no one of the canons of fair disputation in his use of the Socratic dialogue.

Another charge that has been brought against our author is that he had recourse to ridicule. He replies that a censure on this score comes with an ill grace from those who do not scruple to use that keen weapon on their own side. He ought, however, to have remembered, that those who avail themselves of sarcasm and ridicule against what the world holds sacred — as every impugner of the Bible and the Christian revelation, without a single exception known to us, always has done — are most sensitive and fretful when the same instruments are turned against themselves. So long as those who argue against "book revelations" themselves write books with the aim of communicating new light and truth to the world, they can hardly complain with fairness if a Christian affirms that, since men may communicate truth to each other, God may possibly be able to communicate truth to his children.

But the most impotent and futile of all Mr. Newman's efforts are those which he has spent in the endeavor to indicate some "Moral Imperfections" in the character and teachings of Jesus Christ. Unbelievers in the Christian revelation have heretofore sheathed their hostile weapons when they have confronted the character of our Lord and Saviour. Some of the most touching and reverential tributes which he has received have come from those who have rejected his divine authority. If any such unbelievers have really felt that they have reached a standard above him from which they might venture to criticize or censure him, modesty, or something that served its purpose, has withheld their utterance. But Mr. Newman has ventured to specify faults ; and what a sad exposure he makes of an ungenerous purpose, utterly defeated in its aim, and most astoundingly feeble in spite of all his ingenuity, we leave our readers to judge for themselves. The only conceivable effect which his weak and sophistical allegations can have on a candid reader will be that of exciting pity, rather than indignation, toward the writer.

Messrs. Crosby, Nichols, & Co. have in press and will speedily publish a volume containing Mr. Newman's Reply to "The Eclipse of Faith," and his chapter on the "Moral Imperfections" (!) of Jesus, as well as the contents of the volume on which we have been writing.

Archimedes and Franklin. A Lecture introductory to a Course on the Application of Science to Art, delivered before the Massachusetts Charitable Mechanic Association, November 29, 1853. By ROBERT C. WINTHROP. Boston: T. R. Marvin. 1853. 8vo. pp. 47.

OUT of the flood of pamphlets which is incessantly pouring from the press, there are a few which deserve to be gathered out and emphatically commended on the score of an intrinsic and permanent value. The pamphlet before us is one of these. For adaptation to the purpose for which it was designed, for rare felicity of subject and treatment, and for having instigated an honorable and grateful enterprise, it is worthy of a choice place among the riches of literature. The noble Association before which the Lecture was delivered bears the form of Archimedes on its seal, and this leading suggested to Mr. Winthrop a theme of rich and instructive narrative followed by a most appropriate moral. He begins by rehearsing that delightful little narrative, in which Cicero describes his successful search for the grave of Archimedes, which his fellow-citizens of Syracuse had forgotten. Then follows a brilliant sketch of the philosophical and mechanical labors of that old worthy, from which the speaker passes by a very natural step to a fine commemoration of our own Franklin. It is enough to say that the suggestion so eloquently enforced by Mr. Winthrop, that Boston should accord a monumental tribute to Franklin, has been cheerfully answered to by our community, and that the enterprise is in hands whose management of it assures its success.

History of England from the Peace of Utrecht to the Peace of Versailles, 1713 - 1783. By LORD MAHON. In Seven Volumes. Third Edition, revised. Boston: Little, Brown, & Co. 1853. Vol. VI. 12mo. pp. 330, lxiii.

THIS volume of the revised edition of Lord Mahon's History, which Messrs. Little, Brown, & Co. are publishing in connection with a London house, will have an especial interest on our side of the water, because it deals with the events and characters of our own Revolutionary War. The lofty eulogium which the author pronounces upon Washington has been already referred to in our pages, as has also the issue which he raised with Dr. Sparks. Documents bearing upon this issue will be found in the Appendix. Though it is probable that Lord Mahon would from the first have withheld all reflections upon the editorial fidelity of the biographer of Washington, had he really

known the slenderness of the grounds on which he would finally be compelled to justify them, he still retains a slight remnant of censure in the revised pages. We have been interested in the perusal of his judgments and comments upon matters on which, of course, we must look with eyes different from his own. We have no intentional unfairness to lay to his charge. On the contrary, we think he must have occasionally set aside a prejudice, and found in the dictates of charity an honorable explanation of what would have easily admitted of a bad construction. His History seems to be estimated more highly here than in England.

Chronicles selected from the Originals of Cartaphilus, the Wandering Jew. Embracing a Period of nearly Nineteen Centuries. Now first revealed to, and edited by, DAVID HOFFMAN, Hon. J. U. D. of Göttingen. [In two series, each of three volumes.] Series the First. London: Thomas Bosworth. 1853. 8vo. pp. 687, 606.

OFTEN as the legend of the Wandering Jew has been wrought over in literature, and various as have been the forms into which it has been cast, it has found a somewhat novel treatment in these bulky volumes, which, it seems, embrace but a third part of the proposed work. Doubtless, one who takes the books in hand will have first of all to overcome a natural consternation at their size and solidity. But when it is discovered that they deal with authentic history, and use the ubiquitous presence and the continuous biography of the legendary wanderer as a thread on which to hang the facts scattered through many narratives, a reader will conclude to accept their contents for themselves, and to find an impulse to attention in some charm wrought by the element of fiction. A slight but sufficiently definite sketch of the original legend, and of some of its variations, introduces the work, and the opening of the narrative affords an opportunity for rehearsing the earthly life and ministry of Christ under a somewhat peculiar form. The method then pursued by the author allows him a large variety of shapes and materials by which to elaborate from the classics, and other ancient lore, and from a restoration of past scenes and characters, a continuous story full of instruction elevated by piety.

INTELLIGENCE.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

Beecher's Conflict of Ages. — In our extended examination of this remarkable and most honest production of a noble-minded man, we signified that we should watch with great interest the appearance of such reviews of it as should deal with it in a spirit conformed to its own candor of argument. Some very able criticisms upon it have already appeared in the papers and other journals of some of the religious denominations. The Universalist Quarterly gives us a very brilliant and well-reasoned article upon it, while the Christian Review, a Baptist Quarterly, which does honor to the denomination it represents, devotes some well-filled pages to a generous and skilful dealing with a portion of Dr. Beecher's positions, and the Freewill Baptist Quarterly meets the author's theory with a very vigorous statement of the strength and the weakness of its various elements. Dr. Beecher himself was till recently one of the editors of the Congregationalist, a weekly religious newspaper of this city, which divides with the Puritan Recorder the patronage of the two sections of the Trinitarian Congregationalists. In consequence of an influence alleged by Dr. Beecher to have been exerted by the editor of the Puritan Recorder against the Congregationalist, as if the latter paper could be made to suffer from the heresies of one of its editors, Dr. Beecher resigned that office. He published a card in which he assigns this reason for his resignation, and accuses the Recorder of unfair dealing with him. Though we read with care some editorial criticisms in the Recorder upon Dr. Beecher's book, sharply written and evasive of the real issue, we failed to notice the particular *animus* of those criticisms which Dr. Beecher charges upon them. Those criticisms seemed to us conformed in spirit to much of the special pleading of the sect from which they come, and to be addressed rather to the perverted and jaundiced judgment which Calvinism produces, than to the moral instincts with which our Creator has endowed us. The Congregationalist, and that noble paper, the New York Independent, which are both representatives of the freer and progressive spirit at work in the communion served by them, have given fair, though brief, statements of Dr. Beecher's theory, and have most courteously repudiated it. The Bibliotheca Sacra, which is a credit to the theological scholarship of our country, makes a concise but rather ineffective issue with Dr. Beecher, on two or three subsidiary points, in a critical notice, and promises an article upon the book.

Of course it must be expected that the lapse of some considerable length of time be allowed before the full effects of the startling challenge which Dr. Beecher has thrown out to his own brethren will be manifested. Such a work as his acts slowly, and in a great measure secretly, through the channels which feed the minds of men. Most of the critics who have pronounced upon the author and upon his labors have not failed to accord to him the high tribute of conscientious, devout, and scholarly efforts in dealing with his great theme. There have not been wanting some contemptuous and trifling judgments upon

him, but for these a wise man is prepared, and to them an earnest man is indifferent.

The more we have thought upon the contents of the book called "The Conflict of Ages," and have revolved in our minds the revelations which it makes of the conflict in the mind of its author, the more serious is the importance which we attach to it. Our respectful regard for the writer and for the traits of character which he exhibits, is likewise increased by contemplating the issues which he has so boldly stated, at the evident cost of cordiality and confidence from many of his friends. The consequences of the publication and extensive circulation of the work are important in every point of view, but especially as they bear upon the popular faith in the Bible, and upon some of the prominent doctrines which controversy alleges are, or are not, to be found in it. We may assert and believe what we will concerning the external evidences by which the Bible and its divine authority are enforced upon the faith of the common multitude of its uncritical readers; but we all know that its internal evidence is the medium of its hold upon their love and confidence. The stamp and warrant of truth go with its great lessons, its tender and earnest tones, its sublime morals, its addresses to the reason and conscience, its adequate revelations of God and his attributes, the righteousness of his government, and the equity of his laws. Now Dr. Beecher assails the faith of common readers at the very point at which it is strongest, and he deals upon the Bible in the line of its internal evidence a more threatening and disastrous blow than was given by the united assaults of all the infidel writers of the eighteenth century. We make this assertion in all sincerity, and deliberately. The proof of it is easy, for it lies in a statement of the scope of Dr. Beecher's book.

Here is an honored and able minister, who for a quarter of a century has made the Bible his study, has collated its various contents, and fashioned them into a system of doctrines, which he has expounded to more than one congregation, and still proclaims as saving truth to men. He maintains in a rigid sense the inspiration of the contents of the Bible, and receives its lessons as confidently as if he read them written on the skies. He tells us that this book addresses our reason and conscience, and recognizes in us certain claims to an equitable treatment on the part of God, — which claims God himself bids us enforce, by which to try him and his government, as well as ourselves, our nature, and condition. The writer then proceeds to tell us that these fair claims of reason, conscience, and equity, which the Bible accords to us, are utterly set at naught and trampled upon by the system of doctrines which the Bible reveals. The book which contains such sentences as these: — "Come now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord," — "Are not my ways equal?" — "A just scale and balance are the Lord's," — "Why even of yourselves judge ye not what is right?" — charges upon men the guilt of sin committed before they were born, dooms them to endless misery for the consequences of that inherited guilt, and assures us, by inference, that we are living under the government of a more cruel and tyrannical Deity, than the grimmest and most hideous Paganism ever conceived of in a Moloch, or a Baal, or a Juggernaut. What then is to be the effect of an *ex cathedra* statement like this on the *internal evidence* by which the Bible retains its hold upon the faith of nine out of every ten of its common readers? While science and philosophy, and speculative and antiquarian criticism, are assailing all the external and some

of the internal credentials of the Scripture, Dr. Beecher aims a blow at its very heart of life, and finds in it a hollower code than that of Chesterfield's in morals, a more dastardly policy than that of Machiavelli, and enormities of doctrine worse than any which Voltaire or Paine practised by or taught. True, Dr. Beecher proposes an *hypothesis* not recognized, much less advanced, in the Bible, by which its contents may be supplemented, and a sublime harmony may be established between the doctrines of the Bible and the principles of holy equity. But this *hypothesis* is a figment of the human brain, though it claims to be advanced to an equality with the doctrines of revelation. Even more than this: as an *equality* with those doctrines will not express the whole and paramount importance of this hypothesis, for it is the keystone of the arch of doctrines. How can it be but that thousands of the readers of the Bible, if they be also readers of this book, will ask themselves, If the Bible needs the supplement of human fancies or theories, will it not be wiser for us to conjure out a complete religion from our own wits, than to make a mosaic creed out of Scripture and philosophy? There is a stern, outspoken positiveness of conviction in the averments made by Dr. Beecher concerning the Bible, which will find its counterpart in the judgment of multitudes of readers,—either that the Bible does not contain a revelation from God, or that it does not teach the system which Dr. Beecher finds in it. His theory will be held to be as unsubstantial as the mere mist over a battle-field, where sharp arms and deadly shot are the stern realities.

Again, as to the bearings of that book on the doctrines in controversy between Unitarians and Trinitarians, we should be led far beyond our limits if we wrote half of what is in our minds. Our feelings, however, may be inferred from a statement which we will frankly utter. We consider that book as so manifestly destined to reopen in the most effective way our whole controversy, and, in the long result, to win such a triumph for our general views of the doctrines of the Bible, that we would give our vote to a proposition that one half of the whole sum of fifty thousand dollars which the Unitarians are about to raise for the circulation of their books, should be spent in the dissemination of Dr. Beecher's volume. "The Congregationalist" newspaper, after quoting some of our suggestions as to the consternation which the book would produce among the "Orthodox," writes out the word *Pugh*, and adds a fable about a hen or a chicken. We apprehend that this assumed levity is of the same character as the *whistling* which was recommended to those who were afraid of ghosts when passing a graveyard at night. The word *Pugh*, though not easy to spell, is easily spoken. But it contains a *hard* letter which is also a *silent* one, and we will take it as significant of painful but unexpressed feeling. "The Presbyterian" newspaper uttered that word, or the word *Pshaw*, we forget which, or whether it were even a less dignified one, concerning Dr. Beecher's book. But some peoples' brains are really more substantial than their words of hasty judgment would indicate. We apprehend that we shall all of us yet come to the conclusion, that Dr. Beecher's book is a very serious one, and that neither it nor its consequences are to be dismissed with a jeer.

Messrs. Little, Brown, & Co. have added to their series of publications brought out in the best style of the art, an elegant library edition, in six octavo volumes, of Hume's "History of England, from the Inva-

sion of Julius Cæsar to the Revolution in 1688." There are good reasons why such books should appear in such a form. We think that the honorable and liberal publishing firm to whose members our reading community is so largely indebted, have consulted the laws of good taste and the fitnesses of things in giving us a Boston edition of Hume in this elegant shape. Some books appropriately bear the folio form; their contents entitle them to that solid and dignified presentment. A library never has a seemly look unless it contains a range of folios. Other books, in harmony with their contents, may properly wear diminutive forms, and some have no reason to complain if they are indifferently laid upon a table, or used to keep its equilibrium by being placed under it, to make up for a lameness in one of its legs. But our approved histories demand a shapely octavo form, which shall secure them from all light and mean uses. Now that the relative value of Hume's pages is well defined, his prejudices allowed for, his range of authorities and of materials understood, and his strong biases, which both restricted his search and impaired the fairness of his interpretation of primary documents, are not denied by any one, his History is left to stand wholly on its own merits, and through them, aided by its felicities of style and the tone of its philosophy, it is sure of its place in all libraries.

The edition of the History now before us appears in a bright, clear type, with fair margins of strong, white paper, and the notes at the end of each volume embrace a rich collation of authorities, interspersed with those brilliant and often oracular sentences which are the charm of Hume's style. We hope a generous response will be made to the enterprise of the publishers, and that this edition will adorn many bookshelves and minister to a great many minds throughout our literary land.

The same publishers continue their series of British Poets, by three volumes containing the poetry of Milton, and five containing that of Dryden. We have frequently referred to this beautiful and rapidly extending series of volumes, and we wish once more to commend it to those who lack these treasures of our literature. The style of the volumes has long been familiar through Pickering's edition, in the finest finish of the English press, and the edition before us is in no respect inferior.

Besides a continuation of this series of the Poets, the same firm promise the early publication of Hume's Philosophical Writings and Essays, and an entirely new and annotated edition of Plutarch's Lives.

Under the title of "The Lost Prince," Messrs. G. P. Putnam & Co., of New York, have published a volume by the Rev. J. H. Hanson, containing a full statement of the alleged *facts* which tend to prove the identity of Louis the Seventeenth of France and the Rev. Eleazar Williams, an Indian missionary. The materials of the volume whose authority is undisputed have an interest apart from the main issue with which they are connected, and they make the book a very readable one. As to that main issue, we must confess that a few facts which are not stated have a bearing upon it necessary to be had in view by a reader. However the truth may be, the volume will repay its perusal.

Redfield, of New York, has published, in two volumes, "Sketches of the Irish Bar," by the Rt. Hon. Richard Lalor Sheil, M. P., with

Memoir and Notes by R. Shelton Mackenzie, D.C.L. Fun and wisdom are found in rich measure in these volumes, together with much lively matter of a personal, political, and professional character. The revolutionary relations between Ireland and England, and the elements of agitation which were kept at work by legislation against the Roman Catholics, make nearly every page more or less pugilistic, but always vigorous and lively.

The same publisher has issued, in two volumes, "Poems, Descriptive, Dramatic, Legendary, and Contemplative, by William Gilmore Simms, Esq." The author has established his reputation as a poet and a novelist, and is sure of an increasing fame as the circle of his readers is extended.

OBITUARY.

REV. SETH ALDEN. — The pleasant but retired parish of Lincoln has been twice visited with a remarkable bereavement. Its two successive pastors, after a ministry of like extent, pursued with great similarity of character and spirit, were removed by the same disease, in the same month, though with an interval of five years. Those who knew them intimately saw, no doubt, many points of difference; but both gave themselves heartily to this quiet field of pastoral labor, both had a subdued earnestness admirably adapted to the flock which they led by these "still waters," both preached as impressively by the life as from the pulpit, both were snatched away unwarned, and yet with such foreshadowings of death as gave to their latter ministrations an unction better than any eloquence, — a pathos more effective than any logic.

Our lately deceased brother, Seth Alden, was born in Bridgewater, May 21, 1793. He graduated at Brown University in the class of 1814, conducted the Wakefield Academy the following year, in 1816 pursued his divinity studies at Cambridge, and in the spring of 1819 declined an invitation to the ministry at Bridgewater, to receive a settlement of fifteen years' continuance over the Marlborough church in November of that year. In May, 1835, he succeeded Rev. Dr. Noyes in the Brookfield parish, and labored there with acceptance and profit for ten happy years. His next ministry, at Southborough, lasted but two years and a half. Upon his resignation of this charge, he immediately succeeded Rev. Samuel Ripley in the four years' service at Lincoln which was so beautifully closed by the hand of Death, on the second Sunday afternoon of November, in a friend's pulpit at Westborough.

It would seem, and it was the fact, that Mr. Alden had a strong attachment to country life, an early love for its simple manners, its healthy toils, its unaffected friendships, its peaceful retirements, its unostentatious trusts. He did not care to be known abroad. He loved to live for, with, and in his flock, to be cherished by them, revered by his household, beloved through his neighborhood, esteemed for his work's sake, honored, not for eloquence, but for character, and remembered by his daily walk rather than his Sunday discourse. He was not known generally amongst us: he seemed to attach little regard to what passed outside of the circle of his duty and affection.

Of one thing he could justly boast. He was a direct descendant, on both sides of the house, from the Pilgrims. "John Alden, who came from England with the first party, and who was one of the signers of the original compact in 1620," was his forefather and his prototype. He was, like our friend, "a very worthy, useful, and exemplary man," and was honored by being "an Assistant in the administration of every Governor of Plymouth for sixty-seven years." (Holmes's Annals, Vol. I.) His mother was a Carver, in the direct line from Governor Carver of Plymouth Colony, — so that, as Rev. Mr. Frost remarked in his excellent funeral discourse, "two currents of Pilgrim blood flowed in his veins."

Springing from this faithful stock, it is not strange that the prominent feature of his character was *fidelity*. No duty ever came in his way which was not conscientiously, punctually, cheerfully performed; no occasion ever waited for him, or found his talent "laid away in a napkin." His lamp was always shedding a serene and a brightening light upon his path, from its opening to its close. In his family he was gentle, yet firm, not more affectionate than wise. In his parish he was distinguished by soundness of judgment, integrity of purpose, excellent common-sense, and unhesitating fidelity. Laboring with his own hands, like St. Paul, that he might not burden a feeble society, he honored toil by his sunny spirit. Notwithstanding his frequent suffering by disease of the heart, which almost disabled him from returning home after his afternoon service a fortnight before his decease, he was uniformly cheerful; life was always bright before him; there was a silver lining to the cloud, — the regard of his friends, the love of his family, the reverence of his villagers crowning his exemplary life with peace. Not only was he looked up to by his neighbors as a sincere Christian, on occasion of his burial all work-day tasks being suspended, that the whole population might crowd within the mourning sanctuary; but he was justly a favorite with the rural congregations, — his manly figure, his dignified address, his sound common-sense, his clear conscience, his thorough honesty making his modest presence acceptable. His preaching was thoroughly liberal, yet with a Puritan solemnity, — appealing to conscience rather than to feeling, to judgment more than imagination. He did "not dogmatize where wise men doubt, nor put his own inspiration on a level with that of the Apostles," nor condemn any of true life for differing from him in doctrine; but went through his manly, consistent, practical labors with a soul as clear as a star, to shine, we doubt not, in another firmament, now that he is hidden from us here.

His death was worthy of his life, worthy of remembrance by his brethren in the ministry, worthy of being cherished as an admonition by the congregation to whom his parting words were spoken, and by that other flock whom God has twice startled by his most solemn voice. He was reading in a distinct and earnest tone the last verse of the 106th hymn of Greenwood's collection, and had just finished as appropriate a line as could have been written for his utterance, "And fit us for those realms of joy," when he fell backwards without a struggle or a groan, uttering a more impressive sermon than living lips can breathe upon the uncertainty of life and the waiting presence of death. A hymn by Montgomery, then in his hands, seems meant for his departure: —

"At noon thy labor cease!
Rest on thy sheaves, thy harvest task is done:
Come from the heat of battle, and in peace,
Soldier, go home! with thee the fight is won."